DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 635 EC 302 198

AUTHOR	Simon, Marlene; And Others
TITLE	Effective Practices for Inclusive Programs: A Technical Assistance Planning Guide.
PUB DATE	Dec 92
CONTRACT	G0087C3056-91; G0087C3058-91
NOTE	135p.; In: Campbell, Patrick, and others. Statewide Systems Change Project for the Integration of Severely Disabled Students in California: The PEERS Project (Providing Education for Everyone in Regular Schools). Final Report; see EC 302 196.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Check Lists; *Disabilities; Educational Practices; Effective Schools Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Mainstreaming; Program Administration; *Program Development; School Administration; School Districts; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Severe Disabilities; State Programs; *Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	California

ABSTRACT

This technical assistance planning guide was developed as part of the PEERS (Providing Education for Everyone in Regular Schools) Project, a California project to facilitate the integration of students with severe disabilities previously at special centers into services at regular school sites and to facilitate the integration of students in special classes in regular schools into general education. The guide emphasizes building the capacity of states, school districts, and school sites to provide quality educational programs to students with disabilities in integrated and inclusive environments by providing a framework of technical assistance activities. The guide stresses local ownership and provides self-assessment checklists to evaluate practices at the state, district, and school building levels. After an introduction and suggestions for using the guide, the guide lists (with references) practices shown to be effective at each level. The next three sections address state level planning, district level planning, and building level planning respectively. Provided for each level is an "Effective Practice Checklist," specification of effective practices and supportive strategies, and a "Resource Planning Guide." Checklists and planning forms are appended. (Contains 406 references). (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED358635

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES FOR INCLUSIVE PROGRAMS: A TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLANNING GUIDE

Marlene Simon
Patricia Karasoff
California Research Institute*
San Francisco State University

&

Anne Smith
United States Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs

With Contributions From:

Ann Halvorsen
California State University, Hayward

Tom Neary
California State University, Sacramento

PEERS Project
California State Department of Education

December, 1992

EC 302198

* The preparation of this document was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Education Cooperative Agreements #G0087C3056-91 and #G0087C3058-91. The contents and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to convey our thanks to a number of people who contributed to the development of this technical assistance planning guide. First, a special thanks goes to Dawn Hunter who gave us constructive criticism and invaluable editorial assistance. We also extend our gratitude to Paul Thompson and Robin Buckler for their support and assistance in developing this manuscript. Finally, we would like to acknowledge Swift Pense for her help in preparing earlier drafts.

Introduction

A major focus of education reform efforts designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities has been on developing and implementing inclusive education programs. Inclusive programs provide educational and related services to support students with disabilities in all aspects of school and community life. This includes supporting students with disabilities as they interact with nondisabled peers to fully participate in general education and extracurricular activities. Inclusive education programs require that general educators, special educators, parents, students, and related service providers collaborate to develop and implement innovative strategies to accommodate diverse student needs in typical environments. These inclusive arrangements often present technical assistance challenges in terms of state and district level policy development, school organizational structure, curriculum development, program planning and implementation, and professional practices.

For the past decade, the two types of program models that have dominated reform efforts have included integrated education models and inclusive education models. Initial reform efforts were directed at the movement of students with severe disabilities from separate day schools or residential facilities to separate special education classes in regular schools. In the early stages of these reform efforts students typically received the majority of their instructional day in separate special education classes within the general education school and only minimally interacted with their nondisabled peers (e.g., at lunch, during recess, in the hallways, school assemblies). As educators observed the many benefits of these student interactions and research provided evidence to confirm their observations (Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Madden & Slavin, 1983), support increased for having students with disabilities spend at least part of their instructional day in the general education classroom. These initial experiences with integrated education have produced inclusive education models which fully included students with severe disabilities in general education classes and other age-appropriate settings. Sailor (1991) lists a number of elements common to full inclusion models:

1. All students attend the school to which they would go if they had no disability.

2. A natural proportion (i.e., representative of the school district at large) of students with disabilities occurs at any school site.

3. A zero-rejection philosophy exists so that no student would be excluded on the basis of type or extent of disability.

4. School and general education placements are age-and-grade-appropriate, with no self-contained special education classes operative at the school site.

5. Effective instructional practices such as cooperative learning and peer instructional methods receive significant use in general instructional practice at the school site.

6. Special education supports are provided within the context of the general education class and in other integrated environments (i.e., community and vocational settings, cafeteria, library, etc.).

The essential difference between the two types of approaches is in the use of separate special education classes. Both approaches emphasize placing students with disabilities in the age-appropriate schools they would attend if they were not disabled. Each emphasizes maintaining a natural proportion of students with disabilities at the school site. In addition, each stresses facilitating student interaction with nondisabled peers with approaches such as cooperative learning, peer instruction, and special friends programs. However, a critical difference between these two approaches is that in the integrated model part of the student's day is spent in a special education classroom; this is not the case for inclusive models. In inclusive models students are members of their general education class. Inclusive models also place greater emphasis on using collaborative group decision-making procedures to create learning opportunities for students.

There is strong evidence to suggest that when general education classes and other typical environments are modified to meet the needs of students with disabilities, they make significantly more gains in these placements than in pull-out programs or in other more segregated placements (Madden & Slavin, 1983; Wang & Birch, 1984). In an extensive review of the research on the effects of integrated educational placements for students with severe disabilities, Halvorsen and Sailor (1990) report that such placements were associated with a number of positive outcomes including increased social development, increased interactive behavior, enhanced skill acquisition and generalization, increased health and independence, greater success in meeting IEP objectives, more positive attitudes on the part of nondisabled peers and others in the community, and more normalized adult functioning. Similar studies on the effects of such placements for students with mild disabilities have found that they result in higher academic achievement (Deno, Maruyama, Espin, & Cohen, 1990; Leinhardt, 1980) and greater social-emotional growth (Madden & Slavin, 1983). Recent research suggests the greater the extent to which students with disabilities are included in general education classrooms and other age-appropriate environments, the more likely they are to have positive outcomes (Hunt, Farron-Davis, Staub, Beckstead, Curtis, Karasoff, Sailor, 1992).

In short, we know that well developed inclusive education programs can increase the effectiveness of special education services and supports to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. An extensive knowledge base provides a strong rationale for changing educational systems to support students with disabilities in inclusive environments. However, beginning the change process is one of the greatest challenges currently facing educational systems at the state, district, and building level. Some schools and education agencies are

beginning the change process by developing integrated educational programs at neighborhood or "home" schools. If a state, district, or school site chooses to proceed in this manner, we would encourage them to view this as a first step in an overall change strategy designed to ultimately lead to the development of inclusive educational programs. Others are omitting the intermediate step and are developing inclusive programs from the onset of their commitment.

This technical assistance planning guide emphasizes building the capacity of states, school districts, and school sites to provide quality educational programs to students with disabilities in integrated and inclusive environments by providing a framework for developing technical assistance activities. The guide facilitates planned educational change with a focus on local ownership and provides self-assessment checklists to examine whether effective practices are implemented at the state, district, and school site levels. It also suggests resources and strategies for use in planning technical assistance activities.

References

Deno, S., Maruyama, G., Espin, C., & Cohen, C. (1990). Educating students with mild disabilities in general education classrooms: Minnesota alternatives. Exceptional Children, 57(2), 150-161.

Halvorsen, A. & Sailor, W. (1990). Integration of students with severe and profound disabilities: A review of the research. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Issues and research in special education. N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

Hunt, P., Ferron-Davis, F., Staub, D., Beckstead, S., Curtis, D., Karasoff, P., & Sailor, W. (1992). Educational practices in integrated settings associated with positive student outcomes. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

Leinhardt, G. (1980). Transition rooms: Promoting maturation or reducing education? Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, 55-61.

Madden, N., & Slavin, R. (1983). Mainstreaming students with mild handicaps: Academic and social outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 53, 519-570.

Sailor, W. (1991). Special education in the restructured school. Remedial and Special Education, 12(6), 8-22.

Wang, M.C. & Birch J.W. (1984). Effective special education in regular classes. Exceptional Children, 50(5), 391-398.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Organization and Use of the Guide 4

III. Effective Practices: Supportive Research and Literature 7

IV. State Level Planning

A. Effective Practice Checklist - State Level 16
B. Effective State Practices and Supportive Strategies 17
C. Resource Planning Guide - State Level 20

V. District Level Planning

A. Effective Practice Checklist - District Level 21
B. Effective District Practices and Supportive Strategies 23
C. Resource Planning Guide - District Level 28

VI. Building Level Planning

A. Effective Practice Checklist - Building Level 30
B. Effective Building Level Practices and Supportive Strategies 36
C. Resource Planning Guide - Building Level 55

VII. Resources 62

VIII. Appendices 93

A. Effective Practice Checklists 93
B. Technical Assistance Planning Forms 94

Organization and Use of the Guide

This technical assistance guide is designed to support change strategies at multiple levels by providing a framework for developing technical assistance activities at state, district, and building levels. Therefore, the guide is organized into three sections (i.e., state level practices, district level practices, and building level practices) to address planning needs. Each section includes a checklist of effective practices, a listing of corresponding change strategies, and identifies resources to assist educational programs in developing, adopting and implementing these practices. In addition, each section contains a table which cross references strategies and resources to specific effective practices.

This guide has been constructed with a bottom-up, grass roots change focus rather than a top-down orientation for organizing and planning school reform. Practices at the state and district level focus primarily on issues related to leadership, support, and program planning. While practices at the building level also address leadership, support, and program planning, greater emphasis is placed on the *how to* of providing services to students in inclusive environments. Practices at the building level are divided into three major subgroups: 1) leadership and support; 2) program planning and implementation; and 3) student inclusion. The leadership and support section emphasizes developing a school mission or philosophy to support inclusion and outlines effective practices related to administrative responsibilities and staff supervision. The program planning and implementation section focuses on IEP development, collaborative teamwork, and professional practices. The student inclusion section identifies effective practices for including students with disabilities in general education classes and extracurricular activities. In addition, this component addresses practices to facilitate the development of social relationships between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers.

The practices suggested in this guide should be incorporated into existing state, district, and building level school improvement initiatives. For example, many schools have established school improvement committees that can serve as excellent vehicles for inclusion planning. In addition, aspects of inclusive education responsibilities can be incorporated into existing staff evaluation procedures.

Many people working at different levels (state, district, and school site) play critical roles in establishing and maintaining inclusive programs. This guide is intended for use by a variety of individuals in a number of ways:

* Family members make a vital contribution to inclusive programs; not only in the planning and design of their child's educational program, but also by advocating for inclusion at the building, district, and state levels. Families can use the guide as a foundation for effective advocacy and leadership by developing and planning inclusive educational programs at state and local levels, planning parent training activities, and planning community awareness activities to generate grass roots support and advocacy for inclusion.

- Teachers and instructional support staff with skills to support students in typical settings are critical to the success of inclusive programs. This guide contains strategies and resources for adapting curriculum, materials, and environments as well as collaborative teamwork, functional assessment, instruction of functional activities, and IEP development.

- Related service providers can use the guide to focus on providing therapeutic interventions that are embedded into the student's daily school routine and in other inclusive environments. They may want to concentrate on strategies and resources for practices regarding functional assessment, instruction of functional activities, and collaborative teamwork.

- Building administrators can use the guide to help instructional planning teams solve programmatic issues by identifying building-based and student-centered technical assistance resources.

- Local school district administration can use the guide to promote inclusion through effective leadership, supportive policies, and restructuring or expanding existing systems (i.e., transportation, personnel evaluation program). Central office technical assistance providers can use this guide to tailor their activities to individual school sites and instructional planning teams as well as to plan district-wide inservice training on specific topics.

- State education agencies can use the guide to focus on critical leadership activities to support and facilitate the change process for local education agencies by developing state policies and practices that support inclusion.

Suggested Process for Using the Guide

Step One:

Select and complete an **effective practice needs assessment checklist** from Appendix A for state level, district level, or building level planning. For building level planning, you may elect to narrow your focus by completing only a subgroup of the section (i.e., IEP Development). However, some strategies and resources complement more than one practice. By completing all sections of the building level checklist, you will be able to determine where specific strategies and resources will meet technical assistance needs across multiple areas. This can be helpful in making judicious use of training and staff development resources.

Step Two:

Following completion of the needs assessment checklist, determine which practices to focus on for technical assistance activities. The **technical assistance planning forms** in Appendix B can be used to record the practices you plan to focus on. Some technical assistance planners may want to address each practice identified as a need in some manner, while others may want to prioritize these practices and work on a few at a time.

Step Three:

After selecting the practices targeted for technical assistance activities, turn to the section of the guide which outlines state, district, or building level **effective practices and supportive strategies** (State Level - page 17, District Level - page 23, and Building Level - page 36). Identify the strategies you plan to implement and record them on the technical assistance planning form. Then, list the specific actions that must occur in order to implement each strategy. Assign a planning team member to be responsible for each action and determine a target dates for completion. The planning team members can use the **resource planning guides** (State level - page 20, District Level - page 28, and Building Level - page 55) as needed to complete actions.

Step Four:

The planning team should meet at regular intervals to discuss issues and progress on implementing the plan and to make required modifications. The planning team may also use the checklist at selected intervals to evaluate and document progress in implementing effective inclusive practices.

As suggested earlier, education agencies are unique entities and cannot be expected to approach change in the same manner. Thus, each educational agency and school site will need to adapt the ideas presented here to meet their unique needs.

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES: SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

This section provides citations for the research and literature on best practices for inclusive programs that provide a supportive rationale for the practices outlined in the effective practice checklists found in Appendix A. The full reference listing can be found in the Resources Section which begins on page 63.

State Level Practices

1. **The state develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and considers the local school accountable for serving all students**[1] *(Hamre-Nietupski, Nietupski, & Maurer, 1990); Karasoff, 1991).*

2. **The state develops policies that facilitate district implementation of inclusive programs and eliminates policies that serve as disincentives** *(Hamre-Nietupski, Nietupski, & Maurer, 1990; Karasoff, 1991; Wilson, 1989).*

3. **The state increases the awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive educational programs**[2] *(Karasoff, 1991; Wilson, 1989).*

4. **The state promotes district implementation of inclusive programs** *(Hamre-Nietupski, Nietupski, & Maurer, 1990; Karasoff, 1991; Wilson, 1989).*

5. **The state evaluates inclusive programs and practice to assess the impact of state policies annually** *(Hamre-Nietupski, Nietupski, & Maurer, 1990; Karasoff, 1991).*

District Level Practices

1. **The district develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the local school is accountable for serving all students**[1] *(Freagon, Keiser, Kincaid, Usilton, & Smith, 1992; Karasoff, 1991; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

2. **The district facilitates locally owned change at the school site by providing policies and procedures that support building level implementation** *(Karasoff, 1991; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Wilcox, Ryndak, Butterworth, Eberhard, Kronberg, Panzer, Passenger, Peel, Ramsey, & Steveley, 1989; Wilson, 1989).*

3. **The district promotes awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive programs and the continual updating of these services by seeking inservice training and consultation on an ongoing basis**[2] *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Karasoff, 1991; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Wilson, 1989).*

4. **All school buildings are accessible to students with disabilities served by the district and to other individuals with disabilities in the community who may be employed in or visit these sites**[3] *(Freagon, Keiser, Kincaid, Usilton, & Smith, 1992).*

5. **Students with and without disabilities wait at school bus stops together and ride to and from school on the same bus**[3] *(Freagon, Keiser, Kincaid, Usilton, & Smith, 1992; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987).*

6. **Inclusive programs have been established at each school site and students with disabilities are members of age-appropriate (+/- 1yr.) general education classrooms in the same schools they would attend if they were non-disabled**[4] *(Brown, Long, Udvari-Solner, Davis, VanDeventer, Ahlgren, Johnson, Gruenewald, & Jorgensen, 1988; Falvey, 1989; McDonnell, Hardman, Hightower, & Keifer-O'Donnell, 1991; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Meyer & Kishi, 1985; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Stainback, Stainback, & Forest, 1989).*

7. **Coordinated transition programs for younger and older students have been established (i.e. preschool –> elementary –> MS/Jr. high –> HS –> post-secondary)**[4] *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

8. **School personnel evaluation criteria includes a standard on the inclusion of all students with disabilities into all aspects of the school community**[3] *(Freagon, Keiser, Kincaid, Usilton, & Smith, 1992).*

9. **The district incorporates aspects of inclusive practices into its annual district-wide program evaluation activity** *(Freagon, Keiser, Kincaid, Usilton, & Smith, 1992; Karasoff, 1991).*

Building Level Practices[4]

LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT

Part 1: School Mission/Philosophy

1.1 **The school develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the school is responsible for serving them**[1] *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

1.2 **The school philosophy emphasizes responsiveness to families and encourages active family involvement**[1] *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

1.3 **The school philosophy supports the need for ongoing inservice training, staff development, and technical assistance**[1] *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

Part 2: Administrative Responsibilities & Staff Supervision

2.1 The principal is ultimately responsible for program implementation including staff supervision and evaluation. *(Bogdan & Biklen, 1985; Brinker & Thorpe, 1986; Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

2.2 Special and general education teachers are responsible for:
- **Attending faculty meetings.**
- **Participating in supervisory duties (e.g., lunch/bus/yard duty).**
- **Participating in extracurricular activities (e.g., chaperon dances, work with student clubs).**
- **Following school protocol by keeping principal or appropriate administrator informed on an ongoing basis.**

(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Taylor, 1982).

2.3 There is an ongoing process to support staff in implementing inclusive practices (i.e., time for team planning meetings, opportunities for staff development) *(Halvorsen, Smithey, & Neary, 1992).*

PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Part 3: IEP Development

3.1 Instructional staff and related service providers complete a functional assessment as an initial step in IEP development *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Wilcox, Ryndak, Butterworth, Eberhard, Kronberg, Panzer, Passenger, Peel, Ramsey, & Steveley, 1989).*

3.2 Activity-based evaluations of student interests and family priorities are part of the functional assessment *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Wilcox, Ryndak, Butterworth, Eberhard, Kronberg, Panzer, Passenger, Peel, Ramsey, & Steveley, 1989).*

3.3 Student programs are developed across the following curricular content areas:
- **Communication/Socialization**
- **Personal Management (includes Self Determination)**
- **Recreation/Leisure**
- **Home/Domestic**
- **General Education/Academic**
- **Transition/Vocational**

(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).

3.4 **Parents, general and special education teachers, related service personnel, and students collaborate to write joint IEP goals and objectives** *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Wilcox, Ryndak, Butterworth, Eberhard, Kronberg, Panzer, Passenger, Peel, Ramsey, & Steveley, 1989).*

3.5 **IEPs include personal management objectives to promote student self-advocacy (i.e., decision-making, choice-making, individual responsibility)**[1] *(Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987).*

3.6 **IEP objectives are developed with families and reflect family priorities** *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

3.7 **Student IEPs include instruction of functional activities in age-appropriate school and community settings** *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

3.8 **IEP objectives reflect interaction with nondisabled peers** *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

3.9 **IEPs for students age 14 and older include objectives that address skills and services needed to support transition to adult roles** *(Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Wilcox, Ryndak, Butterworth, Eberhard, Kronberg, Panzer, Passenger, Peel, Ramsey, & Steveley, 1989).*

3.10 **IEP teams use natural proportion guidelines when serving students with disabilities in general education classrooms** *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer & Kishi, 1985; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

3.11 **The supports, aids, curricular modifications and other instructional methods required for the student to be successful in school and community settings are discussed during IEP meetings using a transdisciplinary approach**[3] *(Brophy & Good, 1986; Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Wilcox, Ryndak, Butterworth, Eberhard, Kronberg, Panzer, Passenger, Peel, Ramsey, & Steveley, 1989).*

3.12 **The supports, aids, curricular modifications, and other instructional methods outlined in the IEP are implemented and updated according to the student's progress**[3] *(Brophy & Good, 1986; Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Wilcox, Ryndak, Butterworth, Eberhard, Kronberg, Panzer, Passenger, Peel, Ramsey, & Steveley, 1989).*

Part 4: Collaborative Teamwork

4.1 Teams meet weekly to plan instructional support services for all students *(Freagon, Keiser, Kincaid, Usilton, & Smith, 1992).*

4.2 The team collaborates to: 1) develop peer network/interactive systems; 2) adapt learning objectives for students within the context of the core curriculum; 3) make materials and environmental adaptations; and 4) provide physical assistance as needed *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer & Kishi, 1985; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

4.3 Teams collaborate to provide related services in inclusive settings *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; McDonnell & Hardman, 1989; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

4.4 Teams initiate systematic transition planning to support successful transition from one program to another *(Gaylord-Ross, 1989; Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer & Kishi, 1985; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

4.5 Team members meet informally with one another to discuss ongoing inclusion issues and maintain continuous communication *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

4.6 Teams assist families in accessing community resources *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

Part 5: Professional Practices

5.1 All instructional staff work with students in age-appropriate general education and community settings *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

5.2 Related services staff provide services in general education classrooms and in community settings using transdisciplinary and consultative approaches *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; McDonnell & Hardman, 1989; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

5.3 Instructional staff and related service providers develop adaptations for individual students to facilitate independence across environments *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

5.4 Instructional staff plan activities using materials, instructional procedures and environments that are age-appropriate and individualized *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

5.5 Instructional staff adapt the general education curriculum to address academic and/or community-referenced content areas to meet IEP objectives *(Freagon, Keiser, Kincaid, Usilton, & Smith, 1992; Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

5.6 Instructional staff incorporate ability awareness into general education curriculum on diversity and the human experience *(Hamre-Nietupski, Ayres, Nietupski, Savage, Mitchell, & Bramman, 1989; Murray, 1983; Taylor 1992).*

5.7 Instructional staff and related service providers ensure interaction with nondisabled peers in all activities *(Halvorsen, Smithey, & Neary, 1992; Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987).*

5.8 Instructional staff implement positive behavior management strategies that utilize natural cues/corrections with support from related services personnel and other team members *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

5.9 Instructional staff demonstrate positive attitudes towards and age-appropriate interactions with all students *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).*

STUDENT INCLUSION

Part 6: Student Activities

6.1 Students have access to all school environments for instruction and interactions *(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Taylor, 1982).*

6.2 Students participate in and are included in activities such as:

- music
- art
- library
- gym
- lunch
- assemblies
- clubs
- general education classes
- home economics
- work experience
- recess/break
- computer use
- graduation exercises
- field trips

(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Taylor, 1982).

6.3 Students with disabilities are involved in extracurricular school activities such as:

- clubs
- dances
- after school recreation/day care programs
- scouts

(Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987)

Part 7: Interaction with Peers

7.1 Students' instructional programs incorporate interaction with nondisabled students in the following areas:
- **Communication/Socialization**
- **Personal Management (includes Self Determination)**
- **Recreation/Leisure**
- **Home/Domestic**
- **General Education/Academic**
- **Transition/Vocational**

(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989).

7.2 Students are involved with age-appropriate, nondisabled peers in structured interaction programs such as:
- **Peer tutoring in school and community environments**
- **"PALS" (Partners at Lunch) or lunch buddies**
- **Circle of Friends**
- **Co-worker support at job training site**
- **MAPS**

(Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; McDonnell & Hardman, 1989; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1987; Murray, 1983; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989; Taylor, 1982).

7.3 Social interaction programs are:
- **Well organized**
- **Positive in orientation (emphasizing students' strengths, focusing on functional activities)**
- **Well-attended**
- **Supported by principal, faculty, and parents**
- **Viewed as a positive experience by students**

(Halvorsen, Smithey, & Neary, 1992).

1. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P. (1991). Strategies (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Freagon, S., Keiser, N., Kincaid, M., Usilton, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

4. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Halvorsen, A., Smithey, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

REFERENCES

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, D. (1985). The principal's role in mainstreaming. In D. Biklen, R. Bogdan, D.L. Ferguson, S.J. Searl Jr., & S.J. Taylor, (Eds.), Achieving the complete school: Strategies for effective mainstreaming (pp. 30-51). New York: Teachers College Press.

Brinker, R.P., & Thorpe, M.E. (1986). Features of integrated educational ecologies that predict social behavior among severely mentally retarded and nonretarded students. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 91, 150-159.

Brophy, J., & Good, T.L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Brown, L., Long, E., Udvari-Solner, A., Davis, L., VanDeventer, P., Ahlgren, C., Johnson, F. Gruenewald, L., & Jorgensen, J. (1988). The home school: Why students with severe intellectual disabilities must attend the schools of their brothers, sisters, friends, and neighbors. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(1), 1-7.

Falvey, M.A. (1989). Community-based curriculum: Instructional strategies for students with severe handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Freagon, S., Keiser, N., Kincaid, M., Usilton, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

Gaylord-Ross, R. (1989). Integration strategies for students with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Halvorsen, A., & Sailor, W. (1990). Integration of students with profound disabilities: A review of the research. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed), Issues and research in special education (Vol. 1, pp. 110-172). New York: Teachers College Press.

Halvorsen, A., Smithey, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

Hamre-Nietupski, S., Ayres, B., Nietupski, J., Savage, M., Mitchell, B., & Bramman, H. (1989). Enhancing integration of students with severe disabilities through curricular infusion: A general/special educator partnership. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 24(1), 78-80.

Hamre-Nietupski, S., Nietupski, J., & Maurer, S. (1990). A comprehensive state education agency plan to promote the integration of students with moderate/severe handicaps. Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15(2), 106-113.

Karasoff, P. (1991). Strategies (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

McDonnell, A. & Hardman, M., (1989). The desegregation of America's special schools: Strategies for change. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(1), 68-74.

McDonnell, A., Hardman, M., Hightower, J., & Keifer-O'Donnell, R., (1991, September). Variables associated with in-school and after-school integration of secondary students with severe disabilities. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, p. 243-256.

Meyer, L., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

Meyer, L., & Kishi, G.S. (1985). School integration strategies. In K. Lakin & R. Bruininks (Eds.), Strategies for achieving community integration of developmentally disabled citizens (pp. 231-252). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Murray, C. (1983). Social interaction, disability education, and attitude change: Integrated schooling for students with severe/multiple disabilities. In E. Chigier (Ed.), Special education and social handicap (pp. 109-119). London: Freund Publishing Hours Ltd.

Sailor, W., Anderson, J., Halvorsen, A., Doering, K., Filler, J., & Goetz, L.(1989). The Comprehensive local school: Regular education for all children with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (1989). Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Taylor, S.J. (1982). From segregation to integration: Strategies for integrating severely handicapped students in normal school and community settings. The Journal of The Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps, 8, 42-49.

Wilcox, B., Ryndak, D., Butterworth, J., Eberhard, J., Kronberg, R., Panzer, S., Passenger, B., Peel, D., Ramsey, S., & Steveley, J. (1989). Changing the system: A guide to model implementation support. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Institute for the Study of Developmental Disabilities.

Wilson, W. (1989). Administrative strategies for integrated educational programs. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Integration strategies for students with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Education Agency: _____ Reviewers: _____

_____

_____

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - STATE LEVEL

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
1. The state develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and considers the local school accountable for serving all students.[1]				
2. The state develops policies that facilitate district implementation of inclusive programs and eliminates policies that serve as disincentives.				
3. The state increases the awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive educational programs.[2]				
4. The state promotes district implementation of inclusive programs.				
5. The state evaluates inclusive programs and practice to assess the impact of state policies annually.				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

1. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P. (1991). Revisiter (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P. Abrell, M., & Halvorsen, A. (1992). Process please: A review of effective practices. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

EFFECTIVE STATE PRACTICES AND SUPPORTIVE STRATEGIES

1. **Practice: The state develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and considers the local school accountable for serving all students.**[1]

   Strategies:

   Form a broad-based inclusion task force with key stakeholders and agency representation to collaborate on the change process.

   Develop a shared vision for change and inclusion based on desired student outcomes.

   Develop the mission statement incorporating the following components: a definition of inclusion, a rationale for implementing inclusive educational programs, a belief or vision statement, a brief outline of administrative policies that support inclusive practice, and recommended strategies and procedures for implementation.

2. **Practice: The state develops policies that facilitate district implementation of inclusive programs and eliminates policies that serve as disincentives.** [3]

   Strategies:

   Modify or develop state education policy to support change (i.e., eliminate budgetary disincentives for inclusion; offer school districts grants or other budgetary support).

   Review teacher certification requirements and modifiy as needed.

   Develop and adopt state best practice programmatic guidelines.

   Modify service delivery structure and resource allocations.

   Provide leadership on state task forces to promote inclusion.

3. **Practice: The state increases the awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive educational programs.**[2]

   Strategies:

   Provide leadership training.

   Conduct summer institutes.

   Provide regionalized best practice forums.

Develop content specific training modules in collaboration with institutes of higher education and school district personnel.

Collaborate with institutes of higher education to develop coursework for preservice and inservice personnel preparation.

Utilize regionalized approach for delivery of inservice training.

Utilize trainer of trainers approach for wide dissemination.

Establish regional demonstration/implementation sites.

Identify and attend summer institutes within and outside the state and then share that information with all school districts.

Facilitate networking across the state among parents, school districts, institutes of higher education, and advocacy organizations.

Maintain momentum of knowledge of best practice: promote conference attendance; present at local, state, and national conferences; develop co-presentations with local sites; develop manuals, videotapes, newsletters, articles, etc.; and conduct statewide and districtwide mailings.

4. Practice: **The state promotes district implementation of inclusive programs.**[3]

Strategies:

Guide school districts in developing a shared vision for change and inclusion based on desired student outcomes.

Assist school districts in conducting an inclusion needs assessment and developing an implementation plan to promote adoption of best practice.

Facilitate the development of clear and consistent technical assistance goals and objectives to support the implementation plan.

5. Practice: **The state evaluates inclusive programs and practice to assess the impact of state policies annually.**

Strategies:

Monitor and evaluate state and local policy changes, the number of state agency waiver requests, and the state compliance review process and findings.

Review child count data on the number of students moved into age-appropriate inclusive environments each year.

1. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P. (1991). Strategies (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P., Alwell, M., & Halvorsen, A. (1992). Systems change: A review of effective practices. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

RESOURCE PLANNING GUIDE - STATE LEVEL

Several resources are provided for each of the following practices. These are listed in the Resources section (page 62) of this planning guide and can be located by reference number.

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
1. The state develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and considers the local school accountable for serving all students.[1]	20 21 22 34			184 185 194a	216 225 243	280 289 290 292 293 295	305 306 307 322 323 324 337 344	377
2. The state develops policies that facilitate district implementation of inclusive programs and eliminates policies that serve as disincentives.	26 34 49			152 164 187 194a	243	254 290 293 294 295		370 371
3. The state increases the awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive educational programs.[2]	20 21 22 49			194a 199		254	313 333 334	
4. The state promotes district implementation of inclusive programs.	20 21 22 34	68 96		186 187 194a		277	313 324 334 338	370
5. The state evaluates inclusive programs and practice to assess the impact of state policies annually.				183 194a		267 268 269 270		

1. These effective practices items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Holzinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

2. These effective practices items have been taken or adapted from: Kennedy, P. (1991). Strategies (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

Education Agency: _____ Reviewers: _____

_____

_____

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - DISTRICT LEVEL

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
1. The district develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the local school is accountable for serving all students.[1,3]				
2. The district facilitates locally owned change at the school site by providing policies and procedures that support building level implementation.[3]				
3. The district promotes awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive programs and the continual updating of these services by seeking inservice training and consultation on an ongoing basis.[2,3]				
4. All school buildings are accessible to students with disabilities served by the district and to other individuals with disabilities in the community who may be employed in or visit these sites.[3]				
5. Students with and without disabilities wait at school bus stops together and ride to and from school on the same bus.[3]				
6. Inclusive programs have been established at each school site and students with disabilities are members of age-appropriate (+/- 1yr.) general education classrooms in the same schools they would attend if they were non-disabled.[4]				
7. Coordinated transition programs for younger and older students have been established (i.e. preschool –> elementary –> MS/Jr. high –> HS –> post-secondary).[4]				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - DISTRICT LEVEL

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
8. School personnel evaluation criteria includes a standard on the inclusion of all students with disabilities into all aspects of the school community.[3]				
9. The district incorporates aspects of inclusive practices into its annual district-wide program evaluation activity.[3]				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

1. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P. (1991). Synergy (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Praegan, S., Keiner, N., Klasnik, M., Ueffen, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

4. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Halvorsen, A., Sailsbury, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

5. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P., Atwell, M., & Halvorsen, A. (1992). Program change: A review of effective practices. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

EFFECTIVE DISTRICT PRACTICES AND SUPPORTIVE STRATEGIES

1. **Practice: The district develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the local school is accountable for serving all students.**[1,5]

   Strategies:

   Form a District Inclusion Task Force which includes representation from students, parents, teachers, parents, central office and school site administration, related services personnel, and the business community.

   Develop a shared vision for change and inclusion based on desired student outcomes.

   Develop the mission statement incorporating the following components: a definition of inclusion, a rationale for implementing inclusive educational programs, a belief or vision statement, a brief outline of administrative policies that support inclusive practice, and recommended strategies and procedures for implementation.

   Request that District Inclusion Task Force representatives disseminate the inclusion mission statement to their constituent groups.

2. **Practice: The district facilitates locally owned change at the school site by providing policies and procedures that support building level implementation.**[5]

   Strategies:

   Establish a district-wide advisory board which involves all of the key stakeholders.

   Inclusive education activities occur within the context of existing school planning procedures.

   Develop or utilize the existing district mission statement to anchor the goal of developing inclusive educational programs.

   Establish preschool through transition inclusive programs.

   Modify or develop policies that support change by ensuring that students with disabilities attend the same school they would attend if non-disabled and that they have the same calendar and hours.

   Modify service delivery structure and resource allocations.

   Modify job roles and descriptions.

Develop programmatic guidelines. For example, establish a district support team to develop a community-based instruction procedural guide (i.e., liability, training, transportation, fiscal issues, supervision).

Define service delivery plans and administrative responsibilities within the system (e.g., chain of command; who will supervise teachers and support staff, who do teachers report to, etc.) and disseminate to staff.

Develop building-based support teams composed of general and special educators and related services staff.

Provide ample opportunities for professional growth and district recognition.

3. Practice: **The district promotes awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive programs and the continual updating of these services by seeking inservice training and consultation on an ongoing basis.**[2,5]

Strategies:

Promote conference attendance for parents, teachers, administrators, and school board members.

Provide awareness training within existing staff development and inservice training mechanisms.

Provide opportunities to teachers, parents, administrators, school board members, and other stakeholders to visit exemplary sites.

Provide leadership training for central office and school site administrators.

Develop content specific training modules.

Develop regional demonstration/implementation sites.

Conduct districtwide mailings to keep interested parents and professionals informed of inclusive program progress and upcoming events.

Present information in a variety of formats to a wide array of stakeholders.

Utilize trainer of trainers approach.

Utilize existing district information fairs to disseminate best practice information.

Promote visitations within and across district to share ideas and information.

Share resources such as videotapes, newsletters, and books.

Highlight the benefits of inclusive education for all students at open house/parents' night.

4. **Practice: All school buildings are accessible to students with disabilities served by the district and to other individuals with disabilities in the community who may be employed in or visit these sites.[3]**

   Strategies:

   Evaluate the accessibility of all sites.

   Work through district planning group to ensure that reasonable accommodations are in place.

   Develop a guide that outlines procedures to ensure safety.

5. **Practice: Students with and without disabilities wait at school bus stops together and ride to and from school on the same bus.[3]**

   Strategies:

   Involve transportation representation in all or part of inclusion planning.

   Determine transportation services according to student need, residence, and district transportation practices.

   Assess the level of transportation support needed by individual students.

   Provide individualized support and assistance for students on school buses if required.

6. **Practice: Inclusive programs have been established at each school site and students with disabilities are members of age-appropriate (+/- 1 year) general education classrooms in the same schools they would attend if they were non-disabled.[4]**

   Strategies:

   Form a broad-based inclusion task force with key stakeholders and agency representation to collaborate on the change process.

   Develop a district policy statement which includes a definition and rationale for inclusion as part of the district's overall improvement plan.

   Develop a written district and school site implementation plan for inclusive programs which addresses issues such as heterogeneity, non-catogorical grouping strategies, age-appropriateness of school, home/magnet schools, and geographic location.

   Compile information on attendance area for each student and begin returning students to home schools.

Design student attendance procedures to address issues such as heterogeneity, age-appropriateness of school, home/magnet schools, and geographic location.

Develop a school site implementation plan for inclusive programs.

Develop plans and timelines for establishing inclusive programs across ages/school levels (elementary/middle school/high school/post secondary).

Review the organization and assignment of related service personnel to ensure that students receive the related services outlined in their IEPs.

Develop guidelines for the selection/assignment of teachers and paraprofessionals.

Develop a process for transition between classes and schools utilizing district and site school improvement committees.

Ensure adequate staffing patterns to support technical assistance provision during initial "start up" activities.

7. Practice: **Coordinated transition programs for younger and older students have been established (i.e. preschool –> elementary –> MS/Jr. high –> HS –> post-secondary).**[4]

Strategies:

Develop procedures for transition between classes and schools utilizing district and school improvement committees.

8. Practice: **School personnel evaluation criteria includes a standard on the inclusion of all students with disabilities into all aspects of the school community.**[3]

Strategies:

Develop standards for inclusion with a district-wide advisory board which involves all of the key stakeholders.

Review current school personnel evaluation procedures and revise to incorporate inclusion responsibilities.

Develop policies to ensure that included students count as part of general education teacher's contractual class size and required support services are provided.

9. **Practice: The district incorporates aspects of inclusive practices into its annual district-wide program evaluation activity.**

Strategies:

Analyze effective practice checklist data.

Conduct pre/post I.E.P. reviews.

Evaluate of student, parent, and teacher satisfaction.

Evaluate of student outcomes.

Evaluate training events.

1. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Kennedy, P. (1991). Strategies (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Fenagan, S., Kaiser, N., Kimmel, M., Unlaub, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

4. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Halvorsen, A., Smithey, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

5. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Kennedy, P., Atwell, M., & Halvorsen, A. (1992). Systems change: A review of effective practices. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

RESOURCE PLANNING GUIDE - DISTRICT LEVEL

Several resources are provided for each of the following practices. These are listed in the Resources section (page 62) of this planning guide and can be located by reference number.

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
1. The district develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the local school is accountable for serving all students.[1,5]	20 21 22	84		149a	216 225	266 280 293	305 306 307 322 323 338 344	377
2. The district facilitates locally owned change at the school site by providing policies and procedures that support building level implementation.[5]	4 5 34 49	77	106 137	149a 164 199	225	254 280 293 294 295	306 324 338	362 370
3. The district promotes awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive programs and the continual updating of these services by seeking inservice training and consultation on an ongoing basis.[2,5]	7 8 34 44 48 49	96	106 107 146	149a 199		253 254 270 271 292	312 313 314 329 334	350 351 368 389
4. All school buildings are accessible to students with disabilities served by the district and to other individuals with disabilities in the community who may be employed in or visit these sites.[3]				149a	231	289 292	307 333	
5. Students with and without disabilities wait at school bus stops together and ride to and from school on the same bus.[3]				149a	231	289 292	333 337	362

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
6. Inclusive programs have been established at each school site and students with disabilities are members of age-appropriate (+/- 1yr.) general education classrooms in the same schools they would attend if they were non-disabled.[4]	6 13 21 22 25 29 30 39 42 48	58 59 62 63 68 74 90 91 94 96	104 105 110 115 119 125 135 147 149	151 152 155 157 167 184 185 190 197	212 216 220 221 222 229 231 232	262 267 268 276 289 293 294 295 296	306 315 321 333 337 338 341 344 346 347 349	351 361 364 370 381 393 394 395 399 400 404
7. Coordinated transition programs for younger and older students have been established (i.e. preschool –> elementary –> MS/Jr. high –> HS –> post-secondary).[4]	6 13 42 48	50 56 93	110 116 117 119 145 147 149	156 158 189	229 231 248	263 268 269 282 288 289 293	306	355 358 359 360 372 373 399
8. School personnel evaluation criteria includes a standard on the inclusion of all students with disabilities into all aspects of the school community.[3]	7	68		183			329	368
9. The district incorporates aspects of inclusive practices into its annual district-wide program evaluation activity.[5]						267 268 269 270		

1. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Kennedy, P. (1991). Strategies (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Program, S., Kaiser, N., Kimmel, M., Unikow, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

4. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Halvorsen, A., Sailor, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

5. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Kennedy, P., Alwell, M., & Halvorsen, A. (1992). Systems change: A review of effective practices. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

Education Agency: _____ Reviewers: _____

_____

_____

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL[1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT Part 1: School Mission/Philosophy				
1.1 The school develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the school is responsible for serving them.[2]				
1.2 The school philosophy emphasizes responsiveness to families and encourages active family involvement.[2]				
1.3 The school philosophy supports the need for ongoing inservice training, staff development, and technical assistance.[2]				
Part 2: Administrative Responsibilities & Staff Supervision				
2.1 The principal is ultimately responsible for program implementation including staff supervision and evaluation.				
2.2 Special and general education teachers are responsible for: - Attending faculty meetings. - Participating in supervisory duties (e.g., lunch/bus/yard duty). - Participating in extracurricular activities (e.g., chaperon dances, work with student clubs). - Following school protocol; keeping principal or appropriate administrator informed on an ongoing basis.				
2.3 There is a defined plan and/or process for supporting staff in implementation (i.e., time for team planning meetings, opportunities for staff development).				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION Part 3: IEP Development				
3.1 Instructional staff and related service providers complete a functional assessment as an initial step in IEP development.				
3.2 Activity-based evaluations of student interests and family priorities are part of the functional assessment.				
3.3 Student programs are developed across the following curricular content areas: - Communication/Socialization - Personal Management (includes Self Determination) - Recreation/Leisure - Home/Domestic - General Education/Academic - Transition/Vocational				
3.4 Parents, general and special education teachers, related service personnel, and students collaborate to write joint IEP goals and objectives.				
3.5 IEPs include personal management objectives to promote student self-advocacy (i.e., decision-making, choice-making, individual responsibility).[3]				
3.6 IEP objectives are developed with families and reflect family priorities.				
3.7 Student IEPs include instruction of functional activities in age-appropriate school and community settings.				
3.8 IEP objectives reflect interaction with nondisabled peers.				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	• Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
3.9 IEPs for students age 14 and older include objectives that address skills and services needed to support transition to adult roles.				
3.10 IEP/placement teams use natural proportion guidelines when placing students with disabilities in general education classrooms.[1]				
3.11 The supports, aids, curricular modifications and other instructional methods required for the student to be successful in school and community settings are discussed during IEP meetings using a transdisciplinary approach.[3]				
3.12 The supports, aids, curricular modifications, and other instructional methods outlined in the IEP are implemented and updated according to the student's progress.[3]				
Part 4: Collaborative Teamwork				
4.1 Teams meet weekly to plan instructional support services for all students.				
4.2 The team collaborates to: 1) develop peer network/interactive systems; 2) adapt learning objectives for students within the context of the core curriculum; 3) make material and environmental adaptations; and 4) provide physical assistance as needed.[1]				
4.3 Teams collaborate to provide related services in inclusive settings.				
4.4 Teams initiate systematic transition planning to support successful transition from one program to another.[1]				
4.5 Team members meet informally with one another to discuss ongoing inclusion issues and maintain continuous communication.				
4.6 Teams assist families in accessing community resources.[1]				

• Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
Part 5: Professional Practices				
5.1 All instructional staff work with students in age-appropriate general education and community settings.				
5.2 Related services staff provide services in general education classrooms and in community settings using transdisciplinary and consultative approaches.				
5.3 Instructional staff and related service providers develop adaptations for individual students to facilitate independence which are useful across environments.				
5.4 Instructional staff plan activities using materials, instructional procedures and environments that are age-appropriate and individualized.				
5.5 Instructional staff adapt the general education curriculum to address academic and/or community-referenced content areas to meet IEP objectives.				
5.6 Instructional staff incorporate ability awareness into general education curriculum on diversity and the human experience.				
5.7 Instructional staff and related service providers ensure interaction with nondisabled peers in all activities.[1]				
5.8 Instructional staff implement positive behavior management strategies that utilize natural cues/corrections with support from related services personnel and other team members.				
5.9 Instructional staff demonstrate positive attitudes towards and age-appropriate interactions with all students.[1]				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
STUDENT INCLUSION Part 6: Student Activities 6.1 Students have access to all school environments for instruction and interactions.[1] 6.2 Students participate in and are included in activities such as:[1] - music - general education classes - art - home economics - library - work experience - gym - recess/break - lunch - computer use - assemblies - graduation exercises - clubs - field trips 6.3 Students with disabilities are involved in extracurricular school activities such as:[1] - clubs - scouts - dances - after school recreation/day care programs Part 7: Interaction with Peers 7.1 Students' instructional programs incorporate interaction with nondisabled students in the following areas:[1] - Communication/Socialization -Home/Domestic - Personal Management (includes Self Determination) - Recreation/Leisure - Transition/Vocational - General Education/Academic				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
7.2 Students are involved with age-appropriate, nondisabled peers in structured interaction programs such as:[1] - Peer tutoring in school and community environments - "PALS" (Partners at Lunch) or lunch buddies - Circle of Friends - Co-worker support at job training site - MAPS - General education class activities				
7.3 Social interaction programs are:[1] - Well organized - Positive in orientation (emphasizing students' strengths, focusing on functional activities) - Well-attended - Supported by principal, faculty, and parents - Viewed as a positive experience by students				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

1. The majority of the effective practice items contained in this checklist have been adapted from: Halvorsen, A., Smithey, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from : Freagon, S., Keiser, N., Kincaid, M., Usilton, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

EFFECTIVE BUILDING LEVEL PRACTICES AND SUPPORTIVE STRATEGIES[1]

LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT

Part 1: School Mission/Philosophy

1.1 Practices: **The school develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the school is responsible for serving them.[2]**

Strategies:

Form or utilize an existing school improvement committee which includes representation from parents, students, teachers, school administration, related services staff, school advisory council, and the community to address inclusion.

Develop a shared vision for change and inclusion based on desired student outcomes.

Develop the mission statement incorporating the following components: a definition of inclusion, a rationale for implementing inclusive educational programs, a belief or vision statement, a brief outline of administrative policies that support inclusive practice, and recommended strategies and procedures for implementation.

Discuss the school inclusion mission statement with the PTA, school staff, and other interested key stakeholders.

Request that key stakeholders disseminate the inclusion mission statement to their constituent groups.

1.2 Practice: **The school philosophy emphasizes responsiveness to families and encourages active family involvement.[2]**

Strategies:

Form a school improvement committee which includes representation from parents, students, teachers, school administration, related services staff, school advisory council, and the community.

Involve interested parents in planning and evaluating inclusion at the site level (e.g., via school site councils, inclusion task forces, student planning teams, etc.).

Include interested parents in all inservice training activities (as both participants and trainers).

Involve PTA in inclusion efforts.

Communicate regularly with parents.

1.3 Practice: **The school philosophy supports the need for ongoing inservice training, staff development, and technical assistance.**[2]

Strategies:

Conduct inservice training needs assessments across parents, teaching and instructional staff, related services personnel, and administrators.

Incorporate inclusion topics into school's comprehensive inservice plan with suggestions from school personnel.

Work with local university community to address inservice needs.

Provide opportunities for inservice training providers to interact with one another at site and district levels.

Develop a district level support team to guide training efforts for the school community.

Provide opportunities for teachers, staff, and parents to visit model inclusive programs in the district or elsewhere.

Keep faculty informed about inclusive classes (e.g., staff presentations, regular faculty meetings).

Include articles about inclusion in the school newspaper to highlight the importance of inclusion to students, parents, and school personnel and to share successful strategies.

Provide information about inclusion in newsletters to all parents.

Part 2: Administrative Responsibilities & Staff Supervision

2.1 Practice: **The principal is ultimately responsible for program implementation including staff supervision and evaluation.**

Strategies:

Review existing service delivery plans and administrative responsibilities related to chain of command, staff supervision and evaluation; then modify plan to support building-based ownership of inclusive practice.

Ensure that all school personnel, including special education and related services staff, share common information concerning school rules and protocol.

Schedule special education staff for the same lunch periods and preparation periods as general education staff.

Provide leadership training for principals to enhance their skill in supervising all programs.

Design the master schedule to include all students and instructional personnel and accommodate team meetings and planning periods.

Merge special education personnel with general education teams to foster shared responsibility and collaboration.

Develop building level implementation guide for collaboration and inclusion outlining the roles, responsibilities, and process for teaming to individualize student programs following the first school year.

2.2 Practice: **Special and general education teachers are responsible for:**

- **Attending faculty meetings.**
- **Participating in supervisory duties (e.g., lunch/bus/yard duty).**
- **Participating in extracurricular activities (e.g., chaperon dances, work with student clubs).**
- **Following school protocol by keeping principal or appropriate administrator informed on an ongoing basis.**

Strategies:

Ensure that special education is part of overall school restructuring plan.

Involve staff in revising their job descriptions to include inclusion responsibilities.

Ensure that all school personnel, including special education and related service staff, share common information concerning rules and protocol.

2.3 Practice: **There is an ongoing process to support staff in implementing inclusive practices (i.e., time for team planning meetings, opportunities for staff development).**

Strategies:

Review existing service delivery plans and administrative responsibilities on chain of command, staff supervision and evaluation and modify to support building-based ownership of inclusive practice.

Examine alternatives for redeploying existing resources, if necessary, to provide for itinerant support (i.e., alternative staffing patterns).

Provide release time support for preparation activities (e.g., team building and planning, instructional strategies).

Survey staff to determine their interest in and need for organized ability awareness education for themselves and for their students.

Examine within district for resources for training (i.e., identify local expertise).

Use mentor or lead teachers to conduct inservice training and set up peer coaching systems to maintain and reinforce instructional skills.

Include the total school community in collaboration training.

Evaluate the impact and utility of the inservice training activities on student outcomes.

PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Part 3: IEP Development

3.1 Practice: **Instructional staff and related service providers complete a functional assessment as an initial step in IEP development.**

Strategies:

Develop and implement a comprehensive inservice plan with the parents of students with disabilities and school site personnel which addresses functional assessment.

Obtain/develop material and human resources for technical assistance on functional assessment strategies.

Develop a manageable student data collection system for use by general education personnel and/or instructional teams.

Discuss grading and assessment practices and explore mastery and performance-based assessment strategies for all students (i.e., portfolio assessment).

3.2 Practice: **Activity-based evaluations of student interests and family priorities are part of the functional assessment.**

Strategies:

Develop and implement a comprehensive inservice plan with the parents of students with disabilities and school site personnel to address functional assessment.

Select or develop a structured family interview procedure.

Include parents as members of ongoing student planning teams.

3.3 Practice: Student programs are developed across the following curricular content areas:

- **Communication/Socialization**
- **Personal Management (includes Self Determination)**
- **Recreation/Leisure**
- **Home/Domestic**
- **General Education/Academic**
- **Transition/Vocational**

Strategies:

Develop and implement a comprehensive inservice plan across all domains with the parents of students with disabilities and school site personnel (i.e., social relationships, adapting curriculum, cooperative learning, functional assessments).

Obtain/develop technical assistance on adapting curriculum, use of natural supports, delivering instruction in community settings, scheduling staff, training job developers, and site management.

Use mentor or lead teachers to conduct inservices and serve as peer coaches.

Set up peer coaching systems to maintain and reinforce instructional skills.

Examine building policy for barriers to going off site (i.e., liability, training, transportation, fiscal issues, supervision) and then develop a policy and procedures guide which adheres to district policies.

Conduct inventories of community and school environments which are identified by parents via the parent interview process.

Involve related service staff in functional assessments and community-based instruction.

Develop a rotational job sampling program for secondary students.

Coordinate use of job sites across district to avoid seeking duplicate jobs.

Develop a student peer support system (i.e., utilizing natural supports).

Identify and utilize existing generic vocational education opportunities in the district.

Form interagency groups to develop inclusive options at the preschool and post school level with representation from early childhood lead agency, school district, community college, vocational rehabilitation, business community, parents, and self-advocates.

3.4 **Practice: Parents, general and special education teachers, related service personnel, and students collaborate to write joint IEP goals and objectives.**

Strategies:

Develop and implement a comprehensive inservice plan with the parents of students with disabilities and school site personnel which addresses team collaboration issues.

Employ a collaborative process for group decision-making.

Utilize MAPS or similar personal futures planning techniques.

Include parents as members of ongoing student planning teams.

3.5 **Practice: IEPs include personal management objectives to promote student self-advocacy (i.e., decision-making, choice-making, individual responsibility).**[3]

Strategies:

Include student in IEP development and decision-making.

Ensure that student preferences are reflected in IEP goals and objectives.

3.6 **Practice: IEP objectives are developed with families and reflect family priorities.**

Strategies:

Select or develop a structured parent interview procedure for use by site personnel and families.

Review and discuss the parent interview priorities as a team to negotiate issues that may arise when school and family priorities differ.

3.7 **Practice: Student IEPs include instruction of functional activities in age-appropriate school and community settings.**

Strategies:

Obtain/develop technical assistance resources on adapting curriculum, use of natural supports, delivering instruction in community settings, scheduling staff, and training job developers.

Examine building policy for barriers to going off site (i.e., liability, training, transportation, fiscal issues, supervision) and then develop a policy and procedures guide which adheres to district policies.

Conduct inventories of community and school environments which are identified by parents via the parent interview process.

Involve related service staff in functional assessments and community-based instruction.

Develop a rotational job sampling program for secondary students.

Coordinate use of job sites across district to avoid seeking duplicate jobs.

Develop a student peer support system (i.e., utilizing natural supports).

Identify and utilize existing generic vocational education opportunities in the district.

3.8 Practice: **IEP objectives reflect interaction with nondisabled peers.**

Strategies:

Obtain technical assistance on cooperative learning, adapting curriculum, use of natural supports, staff scheduling, and facilitating social interaction and social relationships.

Implement school site practices which promote the development of peer relationships (e.g., inclusion in activities across environments, teacher responsibilities within the school, transportation schedule and coordinated school hours, etc.).

Develop a peer support system (i.e. MAPS, peer tutoring, circle of friends, etc.).

3.9 Practice: **IEPs for students age 14 and older include objectives that address skills and services needed to support transition to adult life.**

Strategies:

Involve relevant adult service agnecies in transition planning within the IEP process.

Obtain/develop technical assistance on adapting curriculum, use of natural supports, delivering instruction in community settings, scheduling staff, and training job developers.

Focus on a variety of community-based vocational experiences for exploration and assessment.

Identify and utilize existing generic vocational education opportunities in the district.

Provide supports and adaptations needed to maintain community vocational education opportunities.

3.10 Practice: **IEP teams use natural proportion guidelines when serving students with disabilities in general education classrooms.**

Strategies:

Define the process for establishing inclusive classes and address issues such as heterogeneity, age-appropriateness of school for students, home/magnet schools, and geographic location.

Develop plans and timelines for establishing inclusive programs across ages/school levels (elementary/middle school/high school/post secondary).

Develop a process for transition between classes and schools at the school site and district level through the instructional planning or building level team process.

Compile information on attendance area for each student and begin a process for returning students to home schools.

Utilize heterogeneous grouping in classroom, school and community environments.

Review the organization and assignment of related service personnel and develop guidelines to ensure that related services are provided in naturally occurring classroom and community contexts.

3.11 Practice: **The supports, aids, curricular modifications and other instructional methods required for the student to be successful in school and community settings are discussed during IEP meetings using a transdisciplinary approach.[3]**

Strategies:

Develop and implement a comprehensive inservice plan across all domains with the parents of students with disabilities and school site personnel (i.e., social relationships, adapting curriculum, cooperative learning, functional assessments).

Develop inservice training for teams which include parents, instructional staff, and related service staff. Focus on issues such as collaborative consultation, role release, and adapting curriculum.

Use mentor or lead teachers and related services personnel to conduct inservices and serve as peer coaches.

3.12 Practice: **The supports, aids, curricular modifications, and other instructional methods outlined in the IEP are implemented and updated according to the student's progress.**[3]

Strategies:

Obtain/develop technical assistance resources on adapting curriculum, use of natural supports, delivering instruction in community settings, scheduling staff, and training job developers.

Develop a manageable student data collection system for use by general education personnel and/or instructional teams.

Discuss grading and assessment practices and explore mastery and performance-based assessment strategies for all students (i.e., portfolio assessment).

Part 4: Collaborative Teamwork

4.1 Practice: **Teams meet weekly to plan instructional support services for all students.**

Strategies:

Revise staff job descriptions to incorporate inclusion responsibilities.

Develop building level implementation guide for collaboration which outlines the roles, responsibilities, and process for teaming to facilitate individualized student programs.

Provide periodic release time for team preparation activities (e.g., team set up and planning; the development of school and community inventories).

Ensure that scheduling and existing coverage enable transdisciplinary teams including parents to meet on a regular basis (i.e., rotating substitute teachers, teacher preparation periods, block scheduling).

Develop and implement a comprehensive inservice plan with parents of students with disabilities and school site personnel.

4.2 Practice: **The team collaborates to: 1) develop peer network/interactive systems; 2) adapt learning objectives for students within the context of the core curriculum; 3) make materials and environmental adaptations; and 4) provide physical assistance as needed.**

Strategies:

Conduct inservice needs assessments across all targeted audiences.

Use mentor or lead teachers or related services staff to conduct inservices and serve as peer coaches.

Obtain technical assistance on adapting curriculum.

Ensure that students receive necessary levels of support when participating in general education (e.g., therapy, paraprofessional support, adaptations, natural supports) and fade supports when they are not required.

4.3 Practice: **Teams collaborate to provide related services in inclusive settings.**

Strategies:

Form interagency groups to develop inclusive options at the preschool and post school level with representation from the early childhood lead agency, school district, community college, vocational rehabilitation, business community, parents, and self-advocates.

Develop inservice training for teams which include parents, instructional staff, and related service staff. Focus on issues such as collaborative consultation and role release.

Set up peer coaching systems to maintain and reinforce related service delivery to students in inclusive contests.

Review the organization and assignment of related service personnel. Design and use a collaborative related services delivery model and provide therapy in inclusive settings.

Reorganize related service personnel's schedules to allow for providing services in natural settings (i.e., block scheduling).

4.4 Practice: **Teams initiate systematic transition planning to support successful transition from one program to another.**

Strategies:

Form interagency groups to develop inclusive options at the preschool and post school level with representation from early childhood lead agency, school district, community college, vocational rehabilitation, business community, parents, and self-advocates.

Outline the transition process between classes and schools at the school site level.

Examine site policy for barriers to going off site (i.e., liability, training, transportation, fiscal issues, supervision) and then develop a policy and procedures guide which adheres to district policies.

Conduct team meeting to develop the Individualized Transition Plan (ITP). Assign responsibilities and timelines to each team participant.

Include vocational training objectives for specific job sampling in the IEPs of students age 14 and older.

4.5 Practice: **Team members meet informally with one another to discuss ongoing inclusion issues and maintain continuous communication.**

Strategies:

Involve all parents of students with disabilities in all school activities such as student planning teams, parent/teacher conferences, and receiving general school mailings regarding school events.

Merge special education personnel with general education teams to foster shared responsibility and collaboration.

Schedule special education staff for the same lunch periods and preparation periods as general education staff.

4.6 Practice: **Teams assist families in accessing community resources.**

Strategies:

Provide families with a listing of community resources and specialized service systems.

Provide families with support from team members in securing needed resources.

Part 5: Professional Practices

5.1 Practice: **All instructional staff work with students in age-appropriate, general education and community settings.**

Strategies:

Revise staff job descriptions to include inclusion responsibilities.

Ensure that the policy on paraprofessionals allows them to implement teacher designed instruction away from the presence of certificated staff.

Examine building policy for barriers to going off site (i.e., liability, training, transportation, fiscal issues, supervision) and then develop a policy and procedures guide which adheres to district policies.

Form interagency groups to develop inclusive options at the preschool and post school level with representation from early childhood lead agency, school district, community college, vocational rehabilitation, business community, parents, and self-advocates.

Conduct inventories of community and school environments which are identified by parents via the parent interview process.

Identify and utilize existing generic daycare and preschool opportunities in the district.

Develop a rotational job sampling program for secondary students.

Identify and utilize existing generic vocational education opportunities in the district.

5.2 Practice: **Related services staff provide services in general education classrooms and in community settings using transdisciplinary and consultative approaches.**

Strategies:

Review the organization and assignment of related service personnel. Design and use a collaborative related services delivery model and provide therapy in inclusive settings.

Develop inservice training for teams which include parents, instructional staff, and related service staff. Focus on issues such as collaborative consultation skills, role release, and adapting curriculum.

Set up peer coaching systems to maintain and reinforce instructional skills used to support included students.

5.3 Practice: **Instructional staff and related service providers develop adaptations for individual students to facilitate independence across environments.**

Strategies:

Schedule multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate skills across environments, trainers, and activities.

5.4 Practice: **Instructional staff plan activities using materials, instructional procedures and environments that are age-appropriate and individualized.**

Strategies:

Obtain/develop technical assistance on cooperative learning

Utilize heterogeneous groups in classroom, school and community environments.

Utilize instructional and related services staff (i.e., therapists, paraprofessionals, etc.) to provide instruction/therapy in general education and community environments.

Discuss grading and assessment practices and explore mastery and performance-based assessment strategies for all students (i.e., portfolio assessment).

Ensure that students receive report cards at the same intervals as their peers.

5.5 Practice: **Instructional staff adapt the general education curriculum to address academic and/or community-referenced content areas to meet IEP objectives.**

Strategies:

Obtain/develop technical assistance on adapting curriculum.

Set up peer coaching systems to maintain and reinforce instructional skills used to support included students.

Use mentor or lead teachers to conduct inservices and serve as peer coaches.

5.6 Practice: **Instructional staff incorporate ability awareness into general education curriculum on diversity and the human experience.**

Strategies:

Survey staff to determine their interest in and need for organized ability awareness education for themselves and for their students.

Include articles about inclusion in the school newspaper before and after these programs are implemented.

Provide information about inclusion in newsletters to all parents.

Schedule presentations by guest speakers who are individuals with disabilities.

Infuse issues on disabilities and diversity within the general education curriculum.

Select media (e.g., library books, films) about successful people with disabilities.

5.7 Practice: **Instructional staff and related service providers ensure interaction with nondisabled peers in all activities**

Strategies:

Conduct building level inservice training on strategies to facilitate social interaction.

Obtain/develop technical assistance on cooperative learning, adapting curriculum, natural supports, and facilitating social relationships.

Implement school site practices to promote the development of peer relationships (e.g., inclusion in activities across environments, transportation schedule, and coordinated school hours, etc.).

Establish mechanisms and procedures for creating structured interaction programs (e.g., peer tutoring, circles of friends) involving general education students (site-based work experience, service credits, elective courses where appropriate).

Utilize natural supports to facilitate social interaction (i.e., enlist support from peers in the general education classroom).

Examine each aspect of the program to determine naturally occurring opportunities for interaction.

Use adaptations of MAPS and Circle of Friends to develop peer friendships and natural supports.

Enlist student participation in instructional and school planning teams to identify existing clubs and extracurricular activities (e.g., utilize the Student Council in developing peer support).

Involve the special education teacher in using their expertise to sponsor clubs and include students.

Examine the role of the paraprofessional and involve them in working with nondisabled students as well as students with disabilities.

5.8 Practice: **Instructional staff implement positive behavior management strategies that utilize natural cues/corrections with support from related services personnel and other team members.**

Strategies:

Develop and implement a comprehensive inservice plan with the parents of students with disabilities and school site personnel to address positive behavioral support strategies.

Use mentor or lead teachers to conduct inservices and set up peer coaching systems to maintain and reinforce positive behavior management skills.

5.9 Practice: **Instructional staff demonstrate positive attitudes towards and age-appropriate interactions with all students.**

Strategies:

Develop and implement a comprehensive inservice plan with parents and school site personnel to address ability awareness and teacher modeling.

Ensure that students are included in all activities (i.e., taking yearbook and class pictures, graduation, orientations, class trips).

STUDENT INCLUSION

Part 6: Student Activities

6.1 Practice: **Students have access to all school environments for instruction and interactions.**

Strategies:

Use heterogeneous grouping strategies.

Work with school site teams to review existing clubs and opportunities for peer support in facilitating participation.

Enlist student participation in instructional and school planning teams.

Utilize natural supports to facilitate social interaction.

Utilize the Student Council in developing peer support.

Enlist support from peers in the general education classroom.

Develop a plan for recruiting general education peers to facilitate peer tutoring or friends programs.

Develop a peer and/or family support system to enable all students to participate.

Utilize instructional and related services staff (i.e., therapists, paraprofessionals, etc.) to support students in inclusive environments.

6.2 Practice: **Students participate in and are included in all activities such as:**

- **music**
- **art**
- **library**
- **gym**
- **lunch**
- **assemblies**
- **clubs**
- **general education classes**
- **home economics**
- **work experience**
- **recess/break**
- **computer use**
- **graduation exercises**
- **field trips**

Strategies:

Ensure that all students are included in master scheduling process.

Develop a peer and/or family support system to enable all students to participate.

Develop a plan for recruiting general education peers to facilitate peer tutoring or friends programs.

Examine the role of the paraprofessional and involve them in working with nondisabled students as well as students with disabilities.

Utilize instructional and related services staff (i.e., therapists, paraprofessionals, etc.) to support students in inclusive environments.

Use heterogeneous grouping strategies.

Work with school site teams to review existing clubs and opportunities for peer support in facilitating participation.

Enlist support from peers in the general education classroom.

Enlist student participation in instructional and school planning teams.

Utilize the Student Council in developing peer support.

6.3 Practice: **Students with disabilities are involved in extracurricular school activities such as:**

- **clubs**
- **dances**
- **after school recreation/day care programs**
- **scouts**

Strategies:

Develop a peer support system and/or family support system to enable all students to participate

Enlist student participation in instructional and school planning teams.

Enlist support from peers in the general education classroom.

Use other support staff (i.e., speech teachers, paraprofessionals, etc.) to provide instruction/therapy in general education and community environments.

Utilize the Student Council to develop peer support.

Work with school site teams to review existing clubs and opportunities for peer support in facilitating participation.

Develop a plan for recruiting general education peers to facilitate peer tutoring or friends programs.

Utilize instructional and related services staff (i.e., therapists, paraprofessionals, etc.) to support students in inclusive environments.

Part 7: Interaction with Peers

7.1 Practice: **Students' instructional programs incorporate interaction with nondisabled students in the following areas:**

- **Communication/Socialization**
- **Home/Domestic**
- **Personal Management (includes Self Determination)**
- **Recreation/Leisure**
- **Transition/Vocational**
- **General Education/Academic**

Strategies:

Obtain/develop technical assistance on cooperative learning, adapting curriculum, use of natural supports, and facilitating social relationships.

Develop school site practices which facilitate peer relationships (e.g., inclusion in activities across environments, teacher responsibilities within the school, transportation schedule and coordinated school hours, etc.).

Develop a plan for recruiting general education peers to facilitate peer tutoring or friends programs.

Develop a peer support system and/or family support system to enable all students to participate.

Enlist student participation in instructional and school planning teams.

Enlist support from peers in the general education classroom.

7.2 Practice: **Students are involved with age-appropriate, nondisabled peers in structured interaction programs such as:**

- **Peer tutoring in school and community environments**
- **"PALS" (Partners at Lunch) or lunch buddies**
- **Circle of Friends**
- **Co-worker support at job training site**
- **MAPS**

Strategies:

Obtain/develop technical assistance on cooperative learning, adapting curriculum, use of natural supports, and facilitating social relationships.

Put in place mechanisms and procedures for creating structured interaction programs (e.g., peer tutoring, circles of friends) involving general education students (site-based work experience, service credits, elective courses where appropriate).

Implement school site practices which promote the development of peer relationships (e.g., inclusion in activities across environments, teacher responsibilities within the school, transportation schedule and coordinated school hours, etc.).

Utilize instructional and related services staff (i.e., therapists, paraprofessionals, etc.) to provide instruction/therapy in general education and community environments.

Utilize natural supports to facilitate social interaction.

Use adaptations of Maps and Circle of Friends for all students.

Develop a plan for recruiting general education peers to facilitate peer tutoring or friends programs.

7.3 Practice: **Social interaction programs are:**

- **Well organized**
- **Positive in orientation (emphasizing students' strengths, focusing on functional activities)**
- **Well-attended**
- **Supported by principal, faculty, and parents**
- **Viewed as a positive experience by students**

Strategies:

Develop and implement a comprehensive inservice plan with parents and school site personnel which addresses social relationships.

Provide parents opportunities to visit model inclusive sites that have social interaction programs in operation.

Provide information about social interaction programs in newsletters to all parents.

Involve PTA in planning social interaction programs.

Involve parents in planning social interaction programs/activities at the site (e.g., via instructional planning teams, school site councils, site level inclusion task forces, etc.).

Evaluate outcomes of social interaction programs on an ongoing basis through student planning teams.

1. The majority of the effective practice items contained in this checklist have been adapted from: Halvorsen, A., Smithey, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from : Freagon, S., Keiser, N., Kincaid, M., Usilton, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

RESOURCE PLANNING GUIDE - BUILDING LEVEL[1]

Several resources are provided for each of the following practices. These are listed in the Resource section (page 62) of this planning guide and can be located by reference number.

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
1.1 The school develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the school is responsible for serving them.[2]				149a 152	215 219 231 248a	268 289 290 293 294 295	305 326 334 337 344	350
1.2 The school philosophy emphasizes responsiveness to families and encourages active family involvement.[2]	11 14 23 27 34 35 36 40 41 48	86 87 88 89	128 142	149a 153 156 159 166	207 233 248a 249	254 262 278 292	304 342	352 354 358 359 379
1.3 The school philosophy supports the need for ongoing inservice training, staff development, and technical assistance.[2]	7 8 44 48	85	107 126 146	149a 197 198	237 246 248a	270 271 292 293 294 295	312 314 329 330 336 339 348	350 351 368
2.1 The principal is ultimately responsible for program implementation including staff supervision and evaluation.	12 22 48	64 91 96	138	149a 197	229 237 248a	252 253 270 293 294 295	305 307 338 343	350 383
2.2 Special and general education teachers are responsible for: (See checklist)			138	149a	237 248a	252 290 292		

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
2.3 There is a defined plan and/or process for supporting staff in implementation (i.e., time for team planning meetings, opportunities for staff development).	48		102	149a 187	248a	293 294 295		
3.1 Instructional staff and related service providers complete a functional assessment as an initial step in IEP development.	16	50 57 78	111 120 130 139 140 141 146	168 171 172 175 176 177 182 187 191	211 213 221 226	250 255 265 266 274 276 290 291 292	330 336 340 347 349	351 365 399 405
3.2 Activity-based evaluations of student interests and family priorities are part of the functional assessment.	16 27	50	128 142	156 166	248a	254 292	342	352 358 359
3.3 Student programs are organized according to the following curricular content areas: (See checklist)	16 28	50 57 65	101 122 130 139 141	156 171 172 173 178 186 199	221 248a	251 281 292	331	
3.4 Parents, general and special education teachers, related service personnel, and students collaborate to write joint IEP goals and objectives.	19	99		187	221 229 248a	265 266 290 292	305 312 314 337 349	351 381 393 396 399
3.5 IEPs include personal management objectives to promote student self-advocacy (i.e., decision-making, choice-making, individual responsibility).[3]	16 28	50 57 65	101 122 130 139 141	156 171 172 173 178 186 199	221	251 254 292	331	352 358 359
3.6 IEP objectives are developed with families and reflect family priorities.	16 27	50	128 142	156 166	211 248a	254 292	342	352 358 359

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
3.7 Student IEPs include instruction of functional activities in age-appropriate school and community settings.	7 10 16 28 31 45	50 57 58 69 74 94 95	100 101 106 112 115 116 118 127 129 136 139	156 163 164 169 170 171 172 173 175 178 180 187 196 199	217 239	251 253 281 285 287 289 292 297 298	317 318 319 327 328	360 362 366 369 374 379 395 400 406
3.8 IEP objectives reflect interaction with nondisabled peers.	3 17 21 24 48	55 70 94 98	129 139	151 167 174 176 177 190 192	201 218 232 240 241 245	258 259 260 264 289 291 292	303 308 310 320 325 340	
3.9 IEPs for students age 14 and older include objectives that address skills and services needed to support transition to adult roles.	7 10 16 28 31 45	50 57 58 67 69 74 92 94 95	100 101 106 112 115 116 118 127 129 136 139	156 163 164 169 170 171 172 173 175 178 180 187 196 199	217 239	251 253 281 285 287 289 292 297 298	317 318 319 327 328	360 362 366 369 374 379 395 400 406
3.10 IEP/placement teams use natural proportion guidelines when placing students with disabilities in general education classrooms.	6 7 13 29 30 42 48	68 90 91	110 119 147 149	150 178 187 193	201 220 221 229 231 232	289 293 294 295	306 349	393 395 399
3.11 The supports, aids, curricular modifications and other instructional methods required for the student to be successful in school and community settings are discussed during IEP meetings using a transdisciplinary approach.[3]	15 16 28	61	101 106 122 130 139 140	160 168 171 172 176 177 187	209 210 213 221 226 239 241 242 248a	254 291 292	340	369 378 380

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
3.12 The supports, aids, curricular modifications, and other instructional methods outlined in the IEP are implemented and updated according to the student's progress.[3]	15 16 28	61	101 106 122 130 139 140	160 168 171 172 176 177 187	209 210 213 221 226 239 241 242 248a	254 291 292	340	369 378 380
4.1 Teams meet weekly to plan instructional support services for all students.	7 8 44 48	61	102 107 146 148		248a	270 271 292	312 314	351 363
4.2 The team collaborates to: (See checklist)	1 7 19 21 27 43 48	61 85 94 98 99	102 111 121 126 128 142 143 145 146 149	150 151 156 166 167 187 190 191 195 197	221 224 229 232 245 248a	250 254 265 266 272 289 290 291 292	305 312 314 315 337 342 349	351 352 358 359 363 381 393 396 399 401
4.3 Teams collaborate to provide related services in inclusive settings.	2 7 19 49	61 68 78 99	102 108 109 111 118 120 132 146	150 151 165 178 182 187 191 193	201 203 204 205 206 220 221 229 244 248a	250 255 265 266 274 276 282 290 292	305 312 314 330 336 337 347 349	351 363 365 381 393 395 397 398 399 405
4.4 Teams initiate systematic transition planning to support successful transition from one program to another.	9 10 19 32 33	50 56 66 67 71 72 83 93	112 113 114 115 116 117 145	156 158 189	230 234 248	263 268 269 282 288 289 299	301 354 345 346	355 358 359 360 372 373 396
4.5 Team members meet informally with one another to discuss ongoing inclusion issues and maintain continuous communication.		99	102 111 146	187 191 197	229 248a	250 290 292	349	351 393 396 399
4.6 Teams assist families in accessing community resources.	27 48	50 56 60 71 72 93	114 116 117 128 142 145	156 166 189	230 234 248	254 288 289 292 299	342 345	352 354 355 358 359 373

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
5.1 All instructional staff work with students in age-appropriate general education and community settings.	7 10 16 19 20 29 30 45	58 68 69 90 94 99	100 112 115 116 118 121 127 136	150 163 164 169 170 178 187 193 195 196	201 220 221 229 232	253 258 259 260 265 266 281 289 290 292 297 298	305 309 312 314 317 328 337 349	351 360 362 366 381 393 395 399 400
5.2 Related services staff provide services in general education classrooms and in community settings using transdisciplinary and consultative approaches.	2 19 49	68 78 99	102 108 109 111 118 120 132 146	150 151 165 178 182 187 191 193	201 203 204 205 206 220 221 229 244 248a	250 255 265 266 274 276 282 290 292	305 312 314 330 336 337 347 349	351 365 381 393 395 397 398 399 405
5.3 Instructional staff and related service providers develop adaptations for individual students to facilitate independence which are useful across environments.	4 5 15 49	51 52 53 54 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 97	101 108 109 111 120 121 122 123 124 130 132 139 140 146	156 165 171 172 173 175 176 177 178 179 182 191 195 197	203 204 205 206 217 221 223 227 228 244 248a	250 254 255 256 261 273 274 275 276 282 283 286 292	325 330 336 347	365 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 395 403 405
5.4 Instructional staff plan activities using materials, instructional procedures and environments that are age-appropriate and individualized.	7 10 16 19 20 29 30 45	58 69 91 94 95 99	100 101 112 115 116 118 122 127 136	156 163 164 169 187 196 197	221 229 232 248a	253 258 259 260 265 266 281 289 290 292 297 298	305 312 314 317 328 332 337 349	351 360 362 366 378 379 381 393 399 400
5.5 Instructional staff adapt the general education curriculum to address academic and/or community-referenced content areas to meet IEP objectives.	1 7 19 20 21 43 48	85 94 98 99	121 126 143	151 167 187 190 195	221 224 229 232 245 248a	265 266 272 289 290 291 292	305 312 314 337 349	351 381 399
5.6 Instructional staff incorporate ability awareness into general education curriculum on diversity and the human experience.	20 44 48	73 94	143 148	151 193	212 246	264 270 292 293 294 295	308 312 314 315 316	351 397 398

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
5.7 Instructional staff and related service providers ensure interaction with nondisabled peers in all activities	3 17 21 24 48	55 70 94 98	129 139	151 161 162 167 174 176 177 190 192	201 218 232 245 240 241 248a	258 259 260 264 289 291 292	303 308 310 320 325 340	
5.8 Instructional staff implement positive behavior management strategies that utilize natural cues/corrections with support from related services personnel and other team members.	48		126 197 229 236 238			292		393 402
5.9 Instructional staff demonstrate positive attitudes towards and age-appropriate interactions with all students.	20	73 94	143	193 197	208 229		315	
6.1 Students have access to all school environments for instruction and interactions.	6 13 19 21 37 39 46 48	58 59 63 94 98 99	102 110 115 119 125 133 135 137 138 147	151 152 154 157 167 180 184 185 197	201 208 218 232 245 248a	252 262 267 268 289 291 292 296 298	300 303 306 337 338 341 344 346	350 365 367 381 393 394 395 399 400 401
6.2 Students participate in and are included in activities such as: (See checklist)	19 21 37 46 48	58 59 63 94 98 99	133 137 138	151 167	201 208 218 232 245 248a	252 289 291 292 298	303 338 341 346	367 401
6.3 Students with disabilities are involved in extracurricular school activities such as: (See checklist)	19 21 37 46 48	58 59 94 98 99	133 137 138	151 167	201 218 232 245	252 289 291 292 298	303 338 341 346	401
7.1 Students' instructional programs incorporate interaction with nondisabled students in the following areas: (See checklist)	3 17 24 48	55 70 94 98 99	126 129 139	151 167 174 176 177 190 192	201 218 232 240 241 245 248a	259 260 264 289 291 292	303 308 310 320 325 340	

Effective Practices	Nos. 1-49	Nos. 50-99	Nos. 100-149	Nos. 150-199	Nos. 200-249	Nos. 250-299	Nos. 300-349	Nos. 350-406
7.2 Students are involved with age-appropriate, nondisabled peers in structured interaction programs such as: (See checklist)	3 17 21 24 38 43 48	55 70 94 98 99	105 126 129 134 139	151 161 162 167 174 176 177 180 181 190 192 194	200 201 218 232 235 240 241 245 247 248a	257 258 259 260 264 272 289 291 292	302 303 308 310 311 320 325 335 340	356 365 375 376 400
7.3 Social interaction programs are: (See checklist)	11 14 23 27 35 48	82 94	128 142 149	153 156 166	200 248a	254 262 278 292	303 342 341	352 358 359 393

1. The majority of the effective practice items contained in this checklist have been adapted from: Halvorsen, A., Smithey, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from : Freagon, S., Keiser, N., Kincaid, M., Usilton, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

RESOURCES

1. Acton, H. M., & Zarbatany, L. (1988). Interaction and performance within cooperative groups: Effects on nonhandicapped students' attitudes toward their mildly mentally retarded peers. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 93(1), 16- 23.

2. Aksamit, D., & Alcorn, D. (1988). A preservice mainstream curriculum infusion model: Student teachers' perceptions of program effectiveness. Teacher Education and Special Education, 11(2), 52-58.

3. Alwell, M., Hunt, P., Goetz, L., & Sailor, W. (1989). Teaching generalized communicative behaviors within interrupted behavior chain contexts. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(2), 91-100.

4. American Occupational Therapy Association (1989). Guidelines for occupational therapy services in school systems (2nd edition). Rockville, MD: Author.

5. American Physical Therapy Association (1980). APTA guidelines for PT practice in educational environments. Washington, DC: Author.

6. Anderson, J.L. (1984). Strategies for obtaining classroom space: Placing students with severe disabilities in regular education schools. Unpublished conference proceedings. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

7. Anderson, J.L., & Doering, K. (1985). The changing role of teachers and administrators in moving from traditional, classroom-based model of instruction for students with severe disabilities. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University.

8. Anderson, J.L., Hill, R., Kennedy, M., Kidd, M., Rosenburg, B., Seifkin, M., & Smith, B. (1987). Teacher facilitators of integration: Key characteristics of model practicum sites. Unpublished document. Hayward, CA: California State University, Hayward.

9. Aveno, A. (1987). A survey of leisure activities engaged in by adults who are severely retarded living in different residence and community types. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 22(2), 121-127.

10. Aveno, A. & Renzaglia, A. (1988). A survey of attitudes of potential community training site staff toward persons with severe handicaps. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 23(3), 213-223.

11. Ayres, C.B. (1988, September). Integration: A parent's perspective. Exceptional Parent, p. 22-25

12. Ayres, B., & Meyer, L (1992, February). Helping teachers manage the inclusive classroom. The School Administrator, p. 30-37.

13. Bagnato, S., Kontos, S., & Neisworth, J.T. (1987). Integrated day care as special education: Profiles of programs and children. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7(1), 28-47.

14. Bailey, D.B., & Winton, P.J. (1987). Stability and change in parents' expectations about mainstreaming. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7(1), 73-78.

15. Barbe, W., Swassing, R., Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1985). Instructional methods: Modalities. In P.B. Guild & S. Garger (Eds.), Marching to different drummers. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

16. Beckstead, S. (1987). Components of curriculum development in a community intensive model. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education, CIPSSI Project.

17. Beckstead, S., Goetz, L. (1990). The educational assessment scale for social interaction: November 1990 revision (revised from the original instrument by Goetz, Haring, & Anderson, 1983). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

18. Biklen, D. (1985). Achieving the complete school: Strategies for effective mainstreaming. New York: Teachers College Press.

19. Biklen, D. (Producer), (1988) Regular lives [videotape]. Washington, D.C.: State of the Art, Inc.

20. Biklen, D. (1989). Making difference ordinary. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, & M. Forest (Eds.), Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education (pp. 235- 248). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

21. Biklen, D., Corrigan, C., & Quick, D. (1989). Beyond obligation: students' relations with each other in integrated classes. In D.K. Lipsky & Gartner (Eds.), Beyond separate education: Quality education for all (pp. 207-221). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

22. Biklen, D., Lehr, S., Searl, S., & Taylor, S. (1987). Purposeful integration... Inherently equal. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, The Center on Human Policy.

23. Biklen, D., & Searl, S. (1985). Parents. In D. Biklen (Ed.), Achieving the complete school: Strategies for effective mainstreaming (pp. 150-173). New York: Teachers College Press.

24. Brady, M., & McEvoy, M. (1989). Social skills training as an integration strategy. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Integration strategies for students with handicaps (pp. 213- 231). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

25. Brady, M.P., McDougall, D., & Dennis, H.F. (1989). The schools, the courts, and the integration of students with severe handicaps. The Journal of Special Education, 23(1), 43-58.

26. Brinker, R. P., & Thorpe, M. E. (1985). Some empirically derived hypotheses about the influence of state policy on degree of integration of severely handicapped students. Remedial and Special Education, 6(3), 18-26.

27. Bronicki, G.J. Buzz, & Turnbull, A.P. (1987). Family-professional interactions. In M. Snell (Ed.), Systematic instruction of persons with severe handicaps. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

28. Brown, L., Branston, M.B., Hamre-Nietupski, S., Pumpian, I., Certo, N., & Gruenewald, L. (1979). A strategy for developing chronological age-appropriate and functional curricular content for severely handicapped adolescents and young adults. The Journal of Special Education, 13(1), 81-90.

29. Brown, L., Long, E., Udvari-Solner, A., Davis, L., VanDeventer, P., Ahlgren, C., Johnson, F. Gruenewald, L., & Jorgensen, J. (1988). The home school: Why students with severe intellectual disabilities must attend the schools of their brothers, sisters, friends, and neighbors. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(1), 1-7.

30. Brown, L., Long, E., Udvari-Solner, A., Schwarz, P., VanDeventer, P. Ahlgren, C., Johnson, F. Gruenewald, L. & Jorgensen, J. (1988). Should students with severe intellectual disabilities be based in regular or in special education classrooms in home schools? Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(1), 8-12.

31. Brown, L., Schwarz, P., Udvari-Solner, A., Kampschroer, G.F., Johnson, F., Jorgensen, J., & Gruenewald, L. (1991). How much time schools students with severe intellectual disabilities spend in regular education classes and elsewhere? Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 16(1), 39-47.

32. Brown, L., Udvari-Solner, A., Long, E., Davis, L., Ahlgren, C., VanDeventer, P., & Jorgensen, J. (1988). Integrated work: A rejection of the segregated enclave and mobile work crew. Unpublished manuscript. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

33. Brown, L., Udvari-Solner, A., Schwarz, P., Courchane, G., Kampschroer, E.F., VanDeventer, P., & Jorgensen, J. (1989). A strategy for evaluating the vocational milieu of a worker with severe intellectual disabilities. Unpublished manuscript. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin and Madison Metropolitan School

34. Bryant, D.M., Ramey, C.T., Sparling, J.J., & Wasik, B.H. (1987). The Carolina approach to responsive education: A model for day care. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7(1), 48-60.

35. Bunch, G. (1989). Community school-based education of severely developmentally delayed students: Precis of an on-going study. Unpublished paper. North York, Ontario, CANADA: York University.

36. Bunch, G. (1991). Full inclusion: Parent and educator objectives for students with challenging needs. Developmental Disabilities, 19(1), 80-102.

37. Burger-McKinley, P., Nietupski, J., Hamre-Nietupski, S., & Erickson, K. (1988). Preparing Schools for the Integrated Education of Students with Severe Handicaps: A Practical Guide for Building Administrators. Instructional Programs, Division of Special Education, Area Education Agency 7.

38. Buswell, B.E. (1989). A workshop on friendship-building strategies. Colorado Springs, CO: PEAK Parent Center, Inc.

39. Buswell, B.E., & Schaffner, C.B. (1991). Opening doors: Strategies for including all students in regular education. Colorado Springs, CO: PEAK Parent Center, Inc.

40. Buswell, B.E., & Venaris, J. (1989). Building integration with the I.E.P. Colorado Springs, CO: PEAK Parent Center, Inc.

41. Cairo, S., Cairo, J., & Cairo, T. (1985). Our brother has Down's Syndrome: An introduction for children. Toronto, CANADA: Annick Press Ltd.

42. Cajon Valley Union School District (1984). Planning for Change. Unpublished report. El Cajon, CA: Cajon Valley Union School District.

43. California Research Institute (Producer) (1984). Getting together: Disability education strategies; Peer tutoring; Nonteaching strategies [videotape]. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

44. California Research Institute (1988). Proceeding from the STRATEGIES (Systems, Techniques, and Resources Towards Establishing GATEWAYS in Integrating Every Student) Conference. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

45. California Research Institute (Producer). (1989). Hands on [videotape]. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

46. California Research Institute (Producer). (1989). Perspectives from principals on full integration [videotape]. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

47. California Research Institute (Producer). (1990). Leadership strategies to support full inclusion [videotape]. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

48. California Research Institute, Providing Education for Everyone in Regular Schools Project, & TASH T.A. (sponsors) (1988). Strategies Conference: Systems, Techniques and Resources Toward Establishing Gateways in Integrating Every Student (Proceedings). San Francisco, CA: California Research Institute, San Francisco State University.

49. California State Department of Education (1980). Guidelines and procedures for meeting the specialized physical health care needs of students. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

50. California State Department of Education (no date). Individual Critical Skills Model (ICSM): Conducting parent/care providers interviews. Unpublished worksheets. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

51. Campbell, P. H. (1986). The integrated programming team: An approach for coordinating multiple discipline professionals in programs for students with severe and multiple handicaps. Akron, OH: Children's Hospital Family Child Learning Center of Akron, Mid-Eastern Ohio Special Education Regional Resource Center, Akron City Schools, Integrated Services Project.

52. Campbell, P. (1987). Integrated programming for students with multiple handicaps. In L. Goetz, D. Goetz, & K. Stremel-Campbell (Eds.), Innovative program design for individuals with dual sensory impairments (pp. 159-188). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

53. Campbell, P. (1987). The integrated programming team: An approach for coordinating professionals of various disciplines in programs for students with severe and multiple handicaps. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(2), 107-116.

54. Campbell, P.H., & Wetherbee, R., Jr. (1988). The integrated programming team: A process for integrating therapy services. Occupational Therapy News, 42(5), 13.

55. Caro, P., & Snell, M. (1989). Characteristics of teaching communication to people with moderate and severe disabilities. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 24(1), 63-77.

56. Center on Human Policy (1989). Resources and Reports on Community Integration (Bibliography). Syracuse, NY: Center on Human Policy.

57. Cicirello, N., Hall, S., & Reed, P. (1987). Developing a collaborative IEP. OR: Oregon Department of Education, Services for Students with Orthopedic Impairments.

58. CIPSSI Project (Producer). (1988). The way to go [videotape]. Seattle, WA: The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

59. Circles of Inclusion Project (1990). A handbook for planning and implementing the integration of young children with severe disabilities into mainstream Montessori preschool and child care programs. Unpublished manual. Lawrence, KS: Author, University of Kansas.

60. Cole, D.A. & Meyer, L.H. (1989). Impact on needs and resources on family plans to seek out-of-home placement. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 93(4), 380- 387.

61. Collins, T. Dirghalli, K., Hindmarsh, J., Jivoff, M., Martin, J., Menges, C., Reddick, J., Ryan, R., Schnoor, B., Smith, B., Wiezalis, S., & Sader, B. (1991). Together each achieves more (TEAM). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, Division of Special Education, The Inclusive Education Project.

62. Colorado Department of Education (Producer). (1990). Learning together [videotape]. Denver, CO: Colorado Department of Education.

63. Community Integration Resource Group (1989). Publications Catalog. Bloomington, IN: Institute for the Study of Developmental Disabilities.

64. Conn, M. (1992, February). How four communities tackle mainstreaming: Aligning our beliefs with action. The School Administrator, p. 22-25.

65. Council Bluffs Community School District (1988). Curriculum guide for students with moderate, severe, and profound disabilities. Council Bluffs, IA: Council Bluffs Community School District.

66. Dattilo, J. (1986). Computerized assessment of preference for severely handicapped individuals. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 19(4), 445-448.

67. Davern, L., Baynor, M., Murphy, M., O'Brien, L., Polly, M. K., Rogers, T., Weber, C., & Winschel, S. (1990). Transition planning for students in the elementary grades: Guidelines

for assisting students who need extra support and planning in moving on to the next grade. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, Division of Special Education, The Inclusive Education Project.

68. Diemer, S.M. (1989). Integrated education for students with severe disabilities and severe behavior problems in Oregon: A teacher survey of the current status and support needs. Unpublished masters' thesis. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Research & Training Center.

69. Doering, K., Hill, R., & Lee, M. (1987). Administrative guidelines: Alameda Unified School District guidelines for a community intensive model. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education.

70. Doering, K., & Hunt, P. (1984). The inventory process for social interaction (IPSI) manual. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute (ERIC Document Reproduction # ED 242 181).

71. Doering, K., Usilton, R., & Farron-Davis, F. (1989). Community Transitional Services Project Manual. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, Community Transitional Services.

72. Doering, K., Usilton, R., Farron-Davis, F., & Sailor, W. (1990). Preparing people with severe disabilities to move from school to work and independent living. Unpublished manual. San Francisco. CA: San Francisco State University, Department of special Education.

73. Donaldson, J. (1980). Changing attitudes toward handicapped persons: A review and analysis of research. Exceptional Children, 46(7), 504-514.

74. Downing, J., & Eichinger, J. (1990). Instructional strategies for learners with dual sensory impairments in integrated settings. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15(2), 98-105.

75. Dunn, W. (1987). Development of the individualized education program and occupational therapy intervention plans. In American Occupational Therapy Association: Guidelines of occupational therapy services in school systems (pp. 8-1 to 8-14). Rockville, MD: American Occupational Therapy Association.

76. Dunn, W. (1988). Models of occupational therapy service provision in the school system. The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 42(11), 718-723.

77. Dunn, W. (1990). A comparison of service provision models in school-based occupational therapy services. Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 10(5), 300- 320.

78. Dunn, W. (1991). Integrated related services. In L. Meyer, C. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds), Critical issues in the lives of people with severe disabilities (pp. 353-377). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

79. Dunn, W. (in press). Occupational therapy. In H.G. Garner (Ed.), Teamwork in the helping professions. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

80. Dunn, W. (in press). The sensorimotor systems: A framework for assessment and intervention. In F.P. Orelove & D. Sobsey (Eds.), Educating children with the multiple disabilities: A transdisciplinary approach (2nd edition). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

81. Dunn, W., Campbell, P.H., Oetter, P.L., Hall, S., & Berger, E. (1989). Guidelines for occupational therapy services in early intervention and preschool services. Rockville, MD: American Occupational Therapy Association.

82. Dybwad, G., Lapin, D., & Worth, P. (Presenters). (no date) Empowerment: Choices and change [audio tape]. Seattle, WA: The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

83. Eastwood, E.A. & Fisher, G.A. (1988). Skills acquisition among matched samples of institutionalized and community-based persons with mental retardation. American Journal of Mental Retardation, 93(1), 75-83.

84. Edmonds, R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 4-11.

85. Eichinger, J., Davern, L.,& Ayres, B. (1989). Integrating students with severe handicaps: Cooperative learning works. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation.

86. Elias, L. (1980). Jason and the neighborhood kids: Mainstreaming on the home front. Exceptional Parent, 10(6), 9-12.

87. Elias, L. (1986). Jason goes to first grade. Exceptional Parent, 16(5), 12-13.

88. Elias, L. (1991). Jason goes to junior high. Exceptional Parent, 21(6), 20-21.

89. Elias, L., Goble, G., Schefer, B., & Jaco, J. (1983). Jason goes to kindergarten. Exceptional Parent, 13(1), 55-57.

90. Ence, R. (1989). Appropriate education for students with handicaps: Collaboration in neighborhood schools. The Special Educator, 9(3), 10- 11.

91. Essig, D.M. (1985). An opportunity, not a burden. Educational Leadership, 43,68-70.

92. Everson, J. M., & Burwell, J. (1991). Transition to work: Addressing the challenges of deaf-blindness. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1(4), 40-45.

93. Everson, J.M., & Moon, M.S. (1987). Transition services for young adults with severe disabilities: Defining professional and parental roles and responsibilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(2), 87-95.

94. Expectations Unlimited, Inc. (Producer). (1990). Inclusion (videotape and written products list). Niwot, CO: Author.

95. Falvey, M.A. (1989). Community-based curriculum: Instructional strategies for students with severe handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

96. Farlow, L., Fisher, M., Snell, M., Janssen, C. & Sailor, W. (1986) What is the least restrictive environment?: Questions and answers for administrators, parents and teachers. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, Dept. of Curriculum, Instruction & Special Education.

97. Fenton, K., Yoshida, R., Maxwell, J., & Kaufman, M. (1979). Recognition of team goals: An essential step toward rational decision making. Exceptional Children, 45(8), 638-644.

98. Filler, J., Goetz, L., & Sailor, W. (1986). Factors which predict opportunities for interaction between students with severe disabilities and their nondisabled peers. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco, CA: California Research Institute, San Francisco State University.

99. Ford, A., & Davern, L. (1989). Moving forward with school integration: Strategies for involving students with severe handicaps in the life of the school. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Integration strategies for students with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

100. Ford, A., & Mirenda, P. (1984). Community instruction: A natural cues and corrections decision model. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 9(2), 79-88.

101. Ford, A., Schnorr, R., Meyer, L., Davern, L., Black, J., & Dempsey, P. (1989). The Syracuse community-referenced curriculum guide for students with moderate and severe disabilities. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

102. Forest, M. (1986). Sabrina and Adrian. Entourage, 1(1), 111-115.

103. Forest, M. (Ed.). (1987). More education/integration: A further collection of readings on the integration of children with mental handicaps into regular school systems. Downsview, Ontario: York University, The G. Allan Roeher Institute.

104. Forest, M. (1988). Full inclusion is possible. Impact, 1(2), 3-4. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

105. Forest, M., & Flynn, G. (Producers). (1989). With a little help from my friends [videotape]. Toronto, Ontario, CANADA: Frontier College, Center for Integrated Education and Community.

106. Fox, T.J., Williams, W., Monley, M.K., McDermott, A., & Fox, W.L. (1989). Guidelines and procedures training manual: Manual III of the Individual Program Design series. Unpublished manuscript, Burlington, VT: University of Vermont.

107. Frank, A. R., Keith, T.Z., Steil, D. A. (1988). Training needs of special education paraprofessionals. Exceptional Children, 55(3), 253-258.

108. Fraser, B., & Hensinger, R. (1983). Managing physical handicaps: A practical guide for parents, care providers, and educators. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

109. Fraser, B., Hensinger, R., & Phelps, J. (1987). Physical management of multiple handicaps: A professional's guide. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

110. Freagon, S., Keiser, N., Kincaid, M., Usilton, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

110.a Freagon, S., & Peters, W.M. (1986). A design for school & community integration of Illinois' children and youth identified as severely handicapped. Unpublished report. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University.

111. Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1990). Collaboration as a predictor for success in school reform. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 1(1), 69-86.

112. Gaylord-Ross, C., Forte, J., & Gaylord-Ross, R. (1985). The community classroom: Technological vocational training for students with serious handicaps. In: Community vocational training for handicapped youth (monograph). San Francisco: San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education.

113. Gaylord-Ross, R. (1987). Vocational integration for persons with mental handicaps: A cross-cultural perspective. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 8, 531-548.

114. Gaylord-Ross, R. (1988). Vocational education for persons with handicaps. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

115. Gaylord-Ross, R. (1989). Integration strategies for students with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

116. Gaylord-Ross, R., Forte, J., Storey, K., Gaylord-Ross, C., & Jameson, D. (1985). Community-referenced instruction in technological work settings. In: Community vocational training for handicapped youth (monograph). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education.

117. Gaylord-Ross, R., Lee, M., Johnston, S., Lynch, K., Rosenberg, B., & Goetz, L. (1991). Supported employment for youth who are deaf-blind and in transition. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 14(1), 77-89.

118. Gee, K., Graham, N., Lee, M., & Goetz, L. (1987). Acquisition of basic sensory and motor skills within natural, integrated contexts with students facing the most serious challenges. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University. Department of Special Education.

119. Gent, P., & Mulhauser, M.B. (1988). Public integration of students with handicaps: Where it's been, where it's going, and how it's getting there. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 13(3), 188-196.

120. Giangreco, M.F. (1990). Making related service decisions for students with severe disabilities: Roles, criteria, and authority. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15(1), 22-31.

121. Giangreco, M.F. (in press). Effects of a consensus-building process on team decision-making: Preliminary data. Division on Physically Handicapped Journal, Council for Exceptional Children.

122. Giangreco, M.F., Cloninger, C., & Iverson, V. (1991). Choosing options and accommodations for children. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.

123. Giangreco, M.F., Edelman, S., & Dennis, R. (1991). Common professional practices that interfere with the integrated delivery of related services. Remedial and Special Education, 12(1), 16-24.

124. Giangreco, M.F., & Eichinger, J. (in press). Related services and the transdisciplinary approach: A parent/professional training module. In M. Anketell, E.J. Bailey, J. Houghton, A. O'Dea, B. Utley, & D. Wickham (Eds.), A series of training modules for educating children and youth with dual sensory and multiple impairments. Monmouth, OR: Teaching Research Publications.

125. Giangreco, M.F., & Putnam, J.W. (1991). Supporting the education of students with severe disabilities in regular education environments. In L. Meyer, C. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds.), Critical issues in the lives of people with severe disabilities (pp. 245- 270). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

126. Gibbs, J. (1986), Tribes: A process for social development and cooperative learning. Pleasant Hill, CA: Center for Human Development.

127. Gilmore, S.L., Barone, C., Beskeen, K., Bryant, B., Farrell, M., Kill, R., Kawahare, L., Knapp, J., Lyall, D., Neary, T., & Yount, M. (1991). Community-based instruction (CBI) procedures manual. Sacramento, CA: Sacramento City Unified School District, Special Education Division.

128. Goetz, L., Anderson, J., & Laten, S. (1989). Facilitation of family support through public school programs. In G. Singer & L.K. Irving (Eds.), Family support services. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

129. Goetz, L., Gee, K., & Sailor, W. (1985). Using the behavior chain interruption strategy to teach communication skills to students with severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 10(1), 21-30.

130. Goetz, L., Guess, D., & Stremel-Campbell, K. (1987). Innovative program design for individuals with sensory impairments. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

131. Goetz, L., & Sailor, W. (1990). Much ado about babies, murky bath water, and trickle down politics: A reply to Kauffman. Journal of Special Education, 24(3), 334-339.

132. Graff, C., Mulligan-Ault, M., Guess, D., Taylor, M., & Thompson, B. (1990). Health care for students with disabilities: A illustrated medical guide for the classroom. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

133. Graham, N., Gee, K., Lee, M., Goetz, L., & Beckstead, S. (1987). Students with significant challenges: Choosing and developing integrated activities in the elementary school. Unpublished manual. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education.

134. Grenot-Scheyer, M., Coots, J., & Falvey, M.A. (1989). Developing and fostering friendships. In M.A. Falvey (Ed.), Community-based curriculum: Instructional strategies for students with severe handicaps (2nd ed., pp. 345-358). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

135. Grenot-Scheyer, M., Coots, J., & Falvey, M.A. (1989). Integration issues and strategies. In M.A. Falvey (Ed.), Community-based curriculum: Instructional strategies for students with severe handicaps (2nd ed., pp. 321-343). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

136. Grossmont Union High School District (1983). Community-based educational programs: A procedural handbook. La Mesa, CA: Grossmont Union High School District, Special Education Program.

137. Gurry, S.E., & Brookline Public Schools (1988). Integration of students with severe handicaps into the Brookline Public Schools: A manual for school staff. Unpublished manuscript. Cambridge, MA: Integrated Program at Pierce School & Lesley College Graduate School.

138. Hall, G. (1987). The principal as leader of the change facilitating team. Unpublished manuscript. Gainesville, FL: Department of Educational Leadership, R&D Center on School Improvement, University of Florida.

139. Halle, J. (1982). Teaching functional language to the handicapped: An integrative model of natural environment teaching techniques. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 7, 29-37.

140. Halle, J. (1987). Teaching language in the natural environment: An analysis of spontaneity. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(1), 28-37.

141. Halle, J.W., & Holt, B. (no date). Stimuli that control responding in the natural environment. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Champaign School District.

142. Halvorsen, A. (1984). The parents and community together (PACT) manual. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute (ERIC Document Reproduction # ED 242 183).

143. Halvorsen, A. (1990). Ability awareness education: Introduction to jigsaw material. Presented at the Special Education Summer Innovation Institute on School Site Teams and Implementation. Hayward, CA: California State University - Hayward, Providing Education for Everyone in Regular Schools Project.

144. Halvorsen, A., Beckstead, S., & Goetz, L. (1990). Schedule analysis of integration education. Hayward, CA: California State University - Hayward, Providing Education for Everyone in Regular Schools Project (PEERS), and San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

145. Halvorsen, A., Doering,K., Farron-Davis, F., Usilton, R., & Sailor, W. (1989). The role of parents and family members in planning severely disabled students' transitions from school. In Singer, G. & Irvin, L.K. (Eds.), Family support services (Chapter 8). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

145a. Halvorsen, A., Smithey, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

146. Halvorsen, A., Smithey, L., & Neary, T. (1988). Developing collaborative regular education-special education school site teams for effective integration. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute, and Hayward, CA: California State University, Hayward, Providing Education for Everyone in Regular Schools Project.

147. Halvorsen, A., & Sailor, W. (1990). Integration of students with profound disabilities: A review of the research. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed), Issues and research in special education (Vol. 1, pp. 110-172). New York: Teachers College Press.

148. Hamre-Nietupski, S., Ayres, B., Nietupski, J., Savage, M., Mitchell, B., & Bramman, H. (1989). Enhancing integration of students with severe disabilities through curricular infusion: A general/special educator partnership. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 24(1), 78-80.

149. Hamre-Nietupski, S., Krajewski, I., Nietupski, J., Ostercamp, D., Sensor, K., & Opheim, B. (1988). Parent/professional partnerships in advocacy: Developing integrated options within resistive systems. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 13(4), 251-259.

150. Hamre-Nietupski, S., Nietupski, J., Ayres, B., Savage, M., Mitchell, B., & Bramman, H. (1989). Enhancing integration of students with severe disabilities through curricular infusion: A general/special educator partnership. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 24(1), 78-88.

151. Hamre-Nietupski, S., Nietupski, J., & Haltmeyer, K. (1987). Project integration: References related to integrating students with severe handicaps with nonhandicapped peers. Unpublished manuscript. Cedar Falls, IA: University of Northern Iowa.

152. Hamre-Nietupski, S., Nietupski, J., & Maurer, S. (1990). A comprehensive state education agency plan to promote the integration of students with moderate/severe handicaps. Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15(2), 106-113.

153. Hanline, M.F., Halvorsen, A. (1989). Parent perceptions of the integration transition process: Overcoming artificial barriers. Exceptional Children, 55(6), 487-492.

154. Hanline, M.F., & Hanson, M.J. (1989). Integration considerations for infants and toddlers with multiple disabilities. Journal for The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(3), 178-183.

155. Hanline, M., & Murray, C. (1984, December). Integrating severely handicapped children into regular public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, p. 273-276.

156. Hanson, M., Farron-Davis, F., Hunt, P., & Doering, K. (1988). The individualized family service plan (IFSP)/The individualized educational program (IEP)/The individualized transition program (ITP). San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

157. Haring, K., Farron-Davis, F., Karasoff, P., Zeph, L., Goetz, L., & Sailor, W., (1992). LRE and the placement of students with severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps,17(3), 145-153.

158. Haring, K., & Lovett, D.L. (1990). A follow-up study of special education graduates. Journal of Special Education, 23(4), 463-477.

159. Haring, K., Lovett, D.L., Saren, D. (1991, Winter). Parent perceptions of their adult offspring with disabilities. Teaching Exceptional Children, p. 6-10.

160. Haring, T., & Breen, C. (1989). Units of analysis of social interaction outcomes in supported education. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(4), 255-262.

161. Haring, T., Breen, C., Pitts-Conway, V., Lee, M., & Gaylord-Ross, R. (1987). Adolescent peer tutoring and special friend experiences. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 280- 286.

162. Haring, T., Falvey, M., Roger, B., & Pitts-Conway, V. (1988). Social interaction/friendships. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

163. Haverkamp, A., Holstege, S., Scott, G., Mahan-Dotta, K., Pomykala, K.L., & Ryan, K. (1989). Community-based instruction (CBI) procedures and forms. Sacramento, CA: Sacramento County Office of Education, Special Education Department.

164. Hawaii Department of Education (1989). Hawaii guidelines for community-based instruction for special education students with moderate and severe handicaps. Unpublished manuscript. Honolulu, HI: Hawaii State Department of Education.

165. Haynie, M., Porter, S., & Palfrey, J. (1989). Children assisted by medical technology in educational settings: Guidelines for care. Boston: Project School Care, The Children's Hospital.

166. Helen Keller National Center (1990). Technical Assistance Center Newsletter. Spring/Summer Issue (plus information materials packet). Sands Point, NY: Author.

167. Hightower, J. (1989). Strategies for Facilitating the Integration of High School Students with Severe Handicaps into Classes in Regular High Schools. Presentation made at the 1989 TASH Annual Conference in San Francisco. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Community-Based Inservice Training Network, University of Utah.

168. Hollowach, K. (1990). Conducting parent/care provider interviews. In Teaching that works: The individual critical skills model. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

169. Hollowach, K., & Patterson, G. (1989). Training and resources for community and curriculum integration. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

170. Hoover, J. (1987). Preparing special educators for mainstreaming: An emphasis upon curriculum. Teacher Education and Special Education, 10(2), 58-64.

171. Horner, R.H., McDonnell, J.J., & Bellamy, G.T. (1986). Teaching generalized skills: General case instruction in simulation and community settings. In R.H. Horner, L.H. Meyer, and H.D. Bud Fredericks (Eds.), Education of learners with severe handicaps: Exemplary service strategies (pp. 289-314). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

172. Horner, R.H., Sprague, J., & Wilcox, B. (1982). Constructing general case programs for community activities. In B. Wilcox & G.T. Bellamy (Eds.), Design of high school for severely handicapped students. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

173. Hunt, P. (1986). I.E.P evaluation instrument. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

174. Hunt, P., Alwell, M., & Goetz, L. (1988). Acquisition of conversation skill and the reduction of inappropriate social interaction behaviors. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 13(1), 20-27.

175. Hunt, P., Alwell, M., & Goetz, L. (1990). Teaching conversation skills to individuals with severe disabilities with a communication book adaptation: Instructional handbook. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

175a. Hunt, P., & Farron-Davis, F. (in press). A preliminary investigation of IEP quality and content associated with placement in general education versus special education classes. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

176. Hunt, P., & Goetz, L. (1988). Teaching spontaneous communication in natural settings through interrupted behavior chains. Topics in Language Disorders, 9(1), 58-71.

177. Hunt, P., Goetz, L., Alwell, M., & Sailor, W. (1986). Using an interrupted behavior chain strategy to teach generalized communication responses. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 11(3), 196-204.

178. Hunt, P., Goetz, L., & Anderson, J. (1986). The quality of IEP objectives associated with placement on integrated versus segregated school sites. Journal of The Association for Person with Severe Handicaps, 11(2), 125-130.

179. Hylton, J., Reed, P., Hall, S., & Cicirello, N. (1987). The role of the physical therapist and the occupational therapist in the school setting. Portland, OR: Oregon Health Sciences University, Crippled Children's Division-University Affiliated Programs, Oregon Department of Education, Therapy in Educational Settings Project. I.N.S.T.E.P.P. Project (1991). Sample IEPs developed from C.O.A.C.H. Durham, NH: Institute on Disability (UAP), University of New Hampshire.

180. I.N.S.T.E.P.P. Project (1991). Student inclusion checklist. Durham, NH: Institute on Disability (UAP), University of New Hampshire.

181. I.N.S.T.E.P.P. Project (1991). What to look for when observing classroom lessons or typical school routines in order to identify participation opportunities for students with severe disabilities. Durham, NH: Institute on Disability (UAP), University of New Hampshire.

182. Institute on Community Integration (1990). Collaborative teamwork: Working together for full inclusion. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

183. Institute on Community Integration (1990). Minnesota post-school follow-up system. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

184. Iowa State Department of Education (1986). Position statement regarding integration of children with moderate and severe handicaps. Unpublished paper. Des Moines, IA: Iowa State Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education.

185. Iowa State Department of Education (1986). The rationale for integration of moderately and severely handicapped students. Unpublished paper. Des Moines, IA: Iowa State Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education.

186. Iowa State Department of Education (1990). Curriculum framework for learners with moderate and severe disabilities. Des Moines, IA: Iowa State Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education.

187. Iverson, V.S., & Cloninger, C.J. (no date). Vermont Integration Planning Process (VIPP): A planning and decision-making process for meeting IEP goals in general education activities. Unpublished paper. Burlington, VT: The State of Vermont I-Team for Intensive Special Education, University of Vermont.

188. Janney, R.E., & Meyer, L.H. (1990). A consultation model to support integrated educational services for students with severe disabilities and challenging behaviors. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15(3), 186-199.

189. Johnson, D.R., Bruininks, R.H., & Thurlow, M.L. (1987). Meeting the challenge of transition service planning through improved interagency cooperation. Exceptional Children, 53(6), 522-530.

190. Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1989). Cooperative learning and mainstreaming. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Integration strategies for students with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

191. Johnson, L.J., Pugach, M.C., & Devlin, S.(1990). Professional collaboration. Teaching Exceptional Children, 23(2), 9-11.

192. Johnson, R.E., & Meyer, L. (1985). Program design and research to normalize peer interactions. In M. Brady & P. Gunter (Eds.), Integrating moderately and severely handicapped learners: Strategies that work (pp. 79-101). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

193. Jones, S.N. & Meisels, S.J. (1987). Training family day care providers to work with special needs children. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7(1), 1-12.

194. Jorgensen, C., Rudy, C., Powers, S., Schug, M., Tashie, C. (1991). Curriculum modification ideas. Durham, NH: Institute on Disability (UAP), University of New Hampshire.

194a. Karasoff, P., Alwell, M., & Halvorsen, A. (1992). Systems change: A review of effective practices. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

195. Kelly, D. (Producer). (1991). Paradise Valley USD: Transdisciplinary teaming for full inclusion in regular classrooms [Videotape]. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

196. Kentucky Systems Change Project (1989). Model local catalogs and curriculum process for students with moderate and severe handicaps. Lexington, KY: Kentucky Special Education Programs.

197. Kjerland, L., Neiss, J., Franke, B., Verdon, C., Westman, E. (1988). Team membership: Who's on first? Impact, 1(2), 15. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

198. Klein, N. & Sheehan, R. (1987). Staff development: A key issue in meeting the needs of young handicapped children in day care settings. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7(1), 13-27.

199. Kleinert, H., Smith, P., & Hudson, M. (1990). Quality program indicators manual for students with moderate and severe handicaps. Lexington, KY: Kentucky Dept. of Education and Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute.

200. Knapczyk, D.R. (1989). Peer-mediated training in cooperative play between special and regular class students in integrated play settings. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 24(3), 255-264.

201. Kugelmass, J.W. (1989). The "shared classroom": A case study of interactions between early childhood and special education staff and children. Journal of Early Intervention, 13(1), 36-44.

202. Kunc, N. (1984). Integration; Being realistic isn't realistic. Canadian Journal for Exceptional Children, 1(1), 41-51.

203. Larson, G. (Ed.) (1988). Managing the school age child with a chronic health condition. Wayzata, MN: DCI Publishing.

204. Lehr, D.H. (1990). Preparation of personnel to work with students with complex health care needs. In A. Kaiser & C. McWhorter (Eds.), Preparing personnel to work with persons with severe disabilities (pp. 135-151). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

205. Lehr, D.H. (in press). Students with complex health care needs in today's schools. In E.L. Meyen (Ed.), Exceptional children in today's schools (2nd ed.). Denver: Love Publishing Co.

206. Lehr, D.H., & Noonan, M.J. (1989). Issues in the education of students with complex health care needs. In F. Brown & D.H. Lehr (Eds.), Persons with profound disabilities: Issues and practices (pp. 139-160). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

207. Lehr, S., & Taylor, S. (Eds.) (1986). Preparing for life: A manual for parents on the least restrictive environment. Boston: Technical assistance for Parent Programs Project.

208. LeRoy, B. (no date). Inclusive school communities: Community building in the classroom. Wayne State University, Michigan Inclusive Education Project, Developmental Disabilities Institute.

209. LeRoy, B. (no date). Inclusive school communities: Inclusive education. Wayne State University, Michigan Inclusive Education Project, Developmental Disabilities Institute.

210. LeRoy, B., England, J. (no date). Inclusive school communities: Instructional process. Wayne State University, Michigan Inclusive Education Project, Developmental Disabilities Institute.

211. LeRoy, B., England, J., Osbeck, T. (no date). Inclusive school communities: Inclusion planning process. Wayne State University, Michigan Inclusive Education Project, Developmental Disabilities Institute.

212. Levy Middle School (1990). Building "community" in the middle school classroom: A collection of ideas and activities from the Levy Middle School staff. Syracuse, NY: The Inclusive Education Project.

213. Lewis, P. (1987, December). A case for teaching functional skills. The Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps Newsletter, p. 6.

214. Lewis, L. (1989). We're in this together: Resource manual for integrating young handicapped children into daycare and preschool programs. Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Education.

215. Lipsky, D.K., & Gartner, A., (1987). Capable of achievement and worthy of respect: Education for handicapped students as if they were full-fledged human beings. Exceptional Children, 54(1), 69-74.

216. Lipsky, D.K., & Gartner, A. (Eds.) (1989). Beyond separate education: Quality education for all. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

217. Lovett, D.L., & Haring, K.A. (1989, December). The effects of self-management training on the daily living skills of adults with mental retardation. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, p. 306-323.

218. Luftig, R.L. (1988). Assessment of the perceived school loneliness and isolation of mentally retarded and non-retarded students. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 92(5), 472-475.

219. Lusthaus, E. (1986). Making a contribution: An emerging social role for persons with a mental handicap. Entourage, 1(2), 24-31.

220. Lusthaus, E. & Forest, M. (1989). MAPS: An action planning system for teaching all children in ordinary classrooms. Unpublished paper. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

221. MacDonald, C., & York, J. (1989). Instruction in regular education classes for students with severe disabilities: Assessment, objectives, and instructional programs. In J. York, T. Vandercook, C. MacDonald, & S. Wolff (Eds.), Strategies for full inclusion. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

222. Mackan, P., & Cormier, L., (no date). The dynamics of support groups. Unpublished manuscript. Toronto, Ontario, CANADA: Frontier College.

223. Magrun, W., & Tigges, K. (1982). A transdiciplinary mobile intervention program for rural areas. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 36(2), 90-94.

224. Maheady, L., Sacca, M.K., & Harper, G.F. (1988). Classwide peer tutoring with mildly handicapped highschool students. Exceptional Children, 55(1), 52-59.

225. Mamary, A., & Rowe, L., (1989). The outcome-driven developmental model: A program for comprehensive school improvement. Johnson City, NY: Johnson City Central School District.

226. Marston, D. (1988). The effectiveness of special education: A time series analysis of reading performance in regular and special education settings. The Journal of Special Education, 21(4), 13-26.

227. Martin, K. (1988). Physical Therapists in educational environments: Focus on educational significance. Totline, 14(2),4.

228. Marvin, C.A. (1987). Consultation services: Changing roles for SLPs. Journal of Childhood Communication Disorders, 11(1), 1-15.

229. McDonnell, A., Brown, G., Rice, D., Schrotz, A., Batemen, B., Bird, M., Bruse, C., Longstroth, C., & Page, M. (1988). Regular and special educators working together: Successfully sharing the responsibility for educating elementary students with severe handicaps. Unpublished paper. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah, Utah Elementary Integration Project.

230. McDonnell, A., & Hardman, M. (1985). Planning the transition of severely handicapped youth from school to adult services: A framework for high school programs. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 275-286.

231. McDonnell, A. & Hardman, M., (1989). The desegregation of America's special schools: Strategies for change. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(1), 68-74.

232. McDonnell, A., Hardman, M., Hightower, J., & Keifer-ODonnell, R., (1991, September). Variables associated with in-school and after-school integration of secondary students with severe disabilities. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, p. 243-256.

233. McDonnell, J. (1987). The integration of students with severe handicaps into regular public schools: An analysis of parents perceptions of potential outcomes. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 22(2), 98-111.

234. McDonnell, J., Wilcox, B., & Boles, S.M. A(1986). Do we know enough to plan for transition? A national survey of state agencies responsible for services to persons with severe handicaps. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 11(1), 53-60.

235. McEvoy, M.A., Shores, R.E., Wehby, J.H., Johnson, S.M., & Foxx, J.J. (1990). Special education teachers' implementation of procedures to promote social interaction among children. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 25,(3), 267-276).

236. McGee, J. (1988). Gentle teaching: A non-aversive approach to helping persons with mental retardation. New York: Human Sciences Press, Inc.

237. McLaughlin, M., & Kienas, K. (no date). A model for increasing the leadership of elementary school principals in special education. Unpublished manuscript. Baltimore: University of Maryland.

238. Meyer, L.H., & Evans, M. (1989). Nonaversive intervention for behavior problems: A manual for home and community. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

238a. Meyer, L., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

239. Meyer, L.H., & Janney, R. (1989). User-friendly measures of meaningful outcomes: Evaluation behavior interventions. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(4), 263-270.

240. Miller, C.T., Malcarne, V.L., Clarke, R.T., Lobato, D., Fitzgerald, M.D., & Brand, P. (1989). What mentally retarded and non-retarded children expect of one another. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 93(4), 396-405.

241. Mirenda, P. (1985). Designing pictorial communication systems for physically able-bodied students with severe handicaps. Augmentive & Alternative Communication, 58-63.

242. Mirenda, P., & Santogrossi, J. (1985). A prompt-free strategy to teach pictorial communication system use. Augmentive & Alternative Communication, 143-150.

243. Morgan, A. D. (1992). New Mexico State Department of Education's administrative policy on full inclusion.(Memo posted Wed., Jan. 8), Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Eduction, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Special Net Bulletin Board, (MSG: GGJC-5066-4609).

244. Mulligan-Ault, M., Guess, D., Struth, L., & Thompson, B. (1988). The implementation of health-related procedures in classrooms for students with severe multiple handicaps. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps. 13(2), 100-109.

245. Murray, C. (1983). Social interaction, disability education, and attitude change: Integrated schooling for students with severe/multiple disabilities. In E. Chigier (Ed.), Special education and social handicap (pp. 109-119). London: Freund Publishing Hours Ltd.

246. Murray, C., & Beckstead, S. (1984). The awareness and inservice manual (AIM). San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute (ERIC Document Reproduction # Ed 242 182).

247. Murray-Seegert, C. (1989). Nasty girls, thugs, and humans like us: Social relations between disabled and nondisabled students in high school. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

248. National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities (no date). A parent's guide to accessing parent groups, community services, and to keeping records. Washington, DC: Author.

248a. Neary, T., Halvorsen, A., Kronberg, R., & Kelly, D. (1992). Curriculum adaptation for inclusive programs. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

249. Nelson, M.J., Buswell, B.E., & Schaffner, C.B. (1989). Integration: A first view - A workshop for parents and educators. Colorado Springs, CO: PEAK Parent Center, Inc.

250. Nevin, A., Thousand, J., Paolucci-Whitcomb, P., & Villa, R. (1990). Collaborative consultation empowering public school personnel to provide heterogeneous schooling for all: Who rang that bell? Journal of Education and Psychological Consultation, 1(1), 41-67.

251. Newton, J. S., Ard, B., Horner, R. H., LeBaron, N., & MacDonald, S. (1991). Supporting choices. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, College of Education, Specialized Training Program, Neighborhood Living Project.

252. Nietupski, J., Hamre-Nietupski, S., Burger, P., & Erickson, K. (1987). A principal's role in integration students with severe handicaps into regular schools. Unpublished manuscript. Cedar Falls, IA: University of Northern Iowa.

253. Nietupski, J., Hamre-nietupski, S., Donder, D., Houselog, M., & Anderson, R. (1988, June). Proactive administrative strategies for implementing community-based programs for students with moderate/severe handicaps. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, p. 138-146.

254. Oregon Department of Education (1987). Guidelines for students with severe orthopedic impairments. Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Education.

255. Orelove, F., & Sobsey, D. (1987). Educating children with multiple disabilities: A transdisciplinary approach. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

256. Orelove, F., & Sobsey, D. (1987). Designing transdisciplinary services. In F. Orelove & Sobsey (Eds.), Education children with multiple disabilities: A transdisciplinary approach. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

257. Osguthrope, R.T. (1985). Trading places: Why disabled students should tutor non-disabled students. Exceptional Parents, 15(6), 41-48.

258. Park, H., & Gaylord-Ross, R. (1989). A problem-solving approach to social skills training in employment settings with mentally retarded youth. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 22(4), 373-380.

259. Park, H., Simon, M., Tappe, P., Wozniak, T., Johnson, B., & Gaylord-Ross, R. (1991). Effects of co-worker intervention and social skills training on the social interaction for mildly handicapped employees. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1(4), 73-90.

260. Park, H., Tappe, P., Simon, M., & Wozniak, T. (in press). Social acceptance of persons with disabilities at employment settings: Assessment and intervention procedures. In Duran (Ed.), Vocational training and employment of moderately and severely handicapped and autistic adolescents with particular attention to bilingual special education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Press.

261. Partin, M.S. (1989). Distinguishing medical from related services: Providing school health services to students who are medically fragile. Unpublished paper. Advocacy, Inc., Austin, Texas.

262. PEAK Parent Center (1988). Discover the possibilities: An integration guide. Colorado Springs, CO: PEAK Parent Center.

263. Peck, C.A. (1988). Review of S.J. Taylor, D. Biklen, & J. Knoll (Eds.), Community integration for people with severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 13(1), 58-61.

264. Peck, C.A., Donaldson, J., & Pezzoli, M. (1990). Some benefits non-handicapped adolescents perceive for themselves from their social relationships with peers who have severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15(4), 241-249.

265. Peck, D.A., Killen, C.C., Baumgart, D. (1989). Increasing implementation of special education in mainstream preschools: Direct and generalized effects of non-directive consultation. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 22(2), 197-210.

266. Phillips, W.C., Alfred, K., Brulli, A.R., & Shank, K.S. (1990). The Regular Education Initiative: The will and skill of regular educators. Teacher Education and Special Education, 13(3-4), 182-186.

267. Piuma, M.F. (1985). A case study: Cost analysis of selected integrated and segregated classrooms serving severely disabled students in San Mateo County. Unpublished doctoral thesis. San Francisco, CA: California Research Institute, San Francisco State.

268. Piuma, M.F. (1989). Benefits and costs of integrating students with severe disabilities into regular public school programs: A study summary of money well spent. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education.

269. Piuma, M.F. (1990). A benefit-cost analysis of integrated and segregated programs serving individuals with severe disabilities: A sourcebook of technical methods and procedures used in the economic analysis. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education.

270. Piuma, M.F., Halvorsen, A., Murray, C., Beckstead, S., & Sailor, W. (1984). The project reach administrators' manual (PRAM). San Francisco: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute (ERIC Document Reproduction # ED 242 185).

271. Pugach, M.C. (1988). Comment: The consulting teacher in the context of educational reform. Exceptional Children, 273-277.

272. Putnam, J.W., Rynders, J.E., Johnson, R.T., & Johnson, D.W. (1989). Collaborative skill instruction for promoting positive interactions between mentally handicapped and nonhandicapped children. Exceptional Children, 55(6), 550-557.

273. Rainforth, B. & Salisbury, C. (1988). Functional home programs: A model for therapists. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7(4), 33-45.

274. Rainforth, B., York, J., & MacDonald, C. (1992). Collaborative teams for students with severe disabilities: Integrating therapy and educational services. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

275. Rainforth, B., & York, J. (1987). Integrating related services in community instruction. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps. 12(3), 198.

276. Raynes, M., Snell, M., & Sailor, W. (1991). Send kids with special needs out or bring specialized staff in? A fresh look at categorical programs. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(4), 326-331.

277. Regional Resource and Federal Center Program (1991). Education reforms and special education: A initial list of state activities. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky, Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute, Mid-South regional Resource Center.

278. Reichart, D.C., Lynch, E.C., Anderson, B.C., Syobodny, L.A., Di Cola, J.M., & Mercury, M.G. (1989). Parental perspectives on integrated preschool opportunities for children with handicaps and children without handicaps. Journal of Early Intervention, 13(1), 6-13.

279. Reynolds, M. C. (1988). Past, present, and future of school integration. Impact, 1(2), 2. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

280. Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53(5), 391-398.

281. Richmond Unified School District (1985). Community based instruction: A resource book for teachers. Richmond, CA: Community-Based Instruction Task Force, Richmond Unified School District, Special Services Division.

282. Richmond Unified School District (no date). Special health care needs of handicapped school children. Richmond, CA: Richmond Unified School District.

283. Roberts, P. (1988). Effectiveness outcomes of physical therapy in schools. Totline, 14(3), 31-35.

284. Rodonovich, S., & Houck, C. (1990). An integrated preschool: Developing a program for children with developmental handicaps. Teaching Exceptional Children, 24(4), 22-26.

285. Rosenketter, S., & Fowler, S. (1986). Teaching mainstreamed children to manage daily transition. Teaching Exceptional Children, 19(1), 20-23.

286. Rourk, J., Dunn, W., Wendt, E., Stephens, L., & Andrews, J. (1987). Setting priorities for providing services. In American Occupational Therapy Association: Guidelines for occupational therapy services in school systems (pp. 9-1 to 9-8). Rockville, MD: American Occupational Therapy Association.

287. Rusch, F. R. (1986). Competitive employment issues and strategies. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

288. Sailor, W. (1989). Phase IV: Transition from school to work and community service. In W. Sailor, J. Anderson, A. Halvorsen, K. Doering, J. Filler, & L. Goetz (Eds.), The comprehensive local school: Regular education for all students with disabilities. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

289. Sailor, W. (1989). The educational, social, and vocational integration of students with the most severe disabilities. In D.K. Lipsky & A. Gartner, (Eds.), Beyond separate education: Quality education for all. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

290. Sailor, W. (1991). Special education in the restructured school. Remedial and Special Education, 12(6), 8-22.

291. Sailor, W., Anderson, J., Halvorsen, A., Doering, K., Filler, J., & Goetz, L. (1989). Phase II: Integrated educational services in the elementary school years. In W. Sailor, J. Anderson, A. Halvorsen, K. Doering, J. Filler, & L. Goetz (Eds.), The comprehensive local school: Regular education for all children with disabilities (Chapter 3). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

292. Sailor, W., Anderson, J., Halvorsen, A., Doering, K., Filler, J., & Goetz, L. (1989). The Comprehensive local school: Regular education for all children with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

293. Sailor, W., Gee, K., & Karasoff, P. (in press). School restructuring and full inclusion. To appear in M. Snell (Ed.), Systematic instruction of persons with severe handicaps (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.

294. Sailor, W., Gerry, M., & Wilson, W. (1991). Policy implications of emergent full inclusion models for the education of students with severe disabilities. In M. L. Wang, H. Walberg, & M. Reynolds (Eds.), The handbook of special education (Vol. IV). Oxford, ENGLAND: Pergamon Press.

295. Sailor, W., Gerry, M., & Wilson, W. (in press). Disability and school integration. To Appear in T. Husen & T.N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), International encyclopedia of education: Research and studies (2nd suppl.). Oxford, ENGLAND: Pergamon Press.

296. Sailor, W., & Goetz, L. (1990). Much ado about babies, murky bath water, and trickle down politics: A reply to Kaufman. The Journal of Special Education, 24(3), 334-339.

297. Sailor, W., Goetz, L., Anderson, J., Hunt, P., & Gee, K. (1988). Research on community intensive instruction as a model for building functional, generalized skills. In R. Horner, G. Dunlap, & R Koegel (Eds.), Generalization and maintenance: Life-style changes in applied settings (pp. 67-98). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

298. Sailor, W., Halvorsen, A., Anderson, J., Goetz, L., Gee, K., Doering, K., & Hunt, P. (1986). Community intensive instruction. In R. Horner, L. Meyer, & B. Fredricks (Eds.), Education of learners with severe handicaps: Exemplary service strategies (pp. 251-288). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

299. Sample, P., Spencer, K., & Bean, G. (1990). Transition planning: Creating a positive future for students with disabilities - A manual for students, parents, educators, and adult service providers. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, Department of Occupational Therapy, Office of Transition Services, Secondary Education Transition Model Project.

300. Samson, R., & Reason, R. (1988). What is successful re-integration? British Journal of Special Education, Research Supplement, 15, 19-23.

301. Sanderson, C., & Richards, D. (1989). Preserving quality programming in an integrated kindergarten classroom. Columbia, CT: EASTCONN Early Childhood Center.

302. Sapon-Shevin, M. (1978). Cooperative instructional games: Alternatives to the spelling bee. The Elementary School Journal, 79(2), 81-87.

303. Sasso, L. G., & Rude, H. A. (1988). The social effects of integration on nonhandicapped children. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 23(1), 18-23.

304. Scaffner, C.B., Buswell, B. E., Summerfield, A., & Kovar, G. (1988). Discover the possibilities: A curriculum for teaching parents about integration. Colorado Springs, CO: PEAK Parent Center, Inc.

305. Schaps, E., & Solomon, D. (1990). Schools and classrooms as caring communities. Educational Leadership, 48(3), 38-42.

306. Schattman, R. (1988). Integrated education and organizational change. Impact, 1(2), 8-9. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

307. Schattman, R., & Benay, J. (1992, February). Inclusive practices transform special education in the 1990s. The School Administrator, p. 8-12.

308. Schnorr, R.F. (1990). "Peter? He comes and goes...": First graders' perspectives on a part-time mainstream students. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15(4), 231-240.

309. Schnorr, R., Ford, A., Davern, L., Park-Lee, S., & Meyer, L. (Eds.) (1989). The Syracuse Curriculum revision manual: A group process for developing a community-referenced curriculum guide. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

310. Schuler, A.L., & Perez, L. (1987). The role of social interaction in the development of thinking skills. Focus on Exceptional Children, 19(7), 1-12.

311. Scott, M.E., & Saunders, K.W. (1989). On target friendship. Teaching Exceptional Children, 21(2), 54-56.

312. Servatius, J.D., Fellows, M.M., & Kelly, D. (1989). Schools are for all kids: The leadership challenge. Unpublished training manual. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

313. Servatius, J. D., Fellows, M., & Kelly, D. (1991). Preparing leaders for inclusive schools. In R. Villa, J. Thousand, W. Stainback, & S. Stainback (Eds.), Restructuring for heterogeneity: An administrative handbook for creating caring and effective schools for everyone. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

314. Servatius, J.D., Fellows, M.M., & Kelly, D. (1992). Meeting the needs of all students. Thrust for Educational Leadership, 20(5), 34-38.

315. Sherwood, S.K. (1990). A circle of friends in a 1st grade classroom. Educational Leadership, 48(3), 41.

316. Shulman, L.S. (1989). Teaching alone, learning together: Needed agendas for the new reforms. In T. Sergiovanni & J. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

317. Siegel, S. (1988). The Career Ladder Program: Implementing Re-Ed principles in vocational settings. Behavioral Disorders, 14, 16-26.

318. Siegel, S., Robert, M., Greener, K., Meyer, G., Halloran, W., Gaylord-Ross, R. (1993). Career ladders for challenged youths in transition from school to adult life. Austin, TX: PRO-ED, Inc.

319. Siegel, S., & Sleeter, C. (1991). Transforming transition: Next stages for the school-to-work transition movement. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 14(1), 27-41.

320. Siperstein, G.N., Bak, J.J., & O'Keefe, P. (1988). Relationship between children's attitudes toward and their social acceptance of mentally retarded peers. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 93(1), 24-27.

321. Skakun, V. (1989). Integration: How can we make it work? In D. Baine, D. Sobsey, L. Wilgosh, & G.M. Kysela (Eds.), Alternative futures for the education of students with severe disabilities (pp. 164-171). Edmonton, Alberta, CANADA: University of Alberta.

322. Skirtic, T.M. (1991). Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization. Denver: Love Publishing Company.

323. Skirtic, T. M. (1991). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. Harvard Educational Review, 61(2), 148-206.

324. Smith, A., Hunter, D., & Schrag, J. (1991, November). America 2000: An opportunity for school restructuring and inclusion. In T. Vandercook, J. York, C. Macdonald, & V. Gaylord (Eds.), Impact, 4(3). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration, (Feature Issue on Inclusive Education).

325. Smith, P.D., & Kleinert, J.O. (1989). Communication programming for students with severe and multiple handicaps. Lexington, KY: University of Kansas, Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute, Kentucky Systems Change Project.

326. Snow, J.A. (1991). Dreaming, speaking, and creating: What I know about community. Developmental Disabilities Bulletin, 19(1), 12-27.

327. Sowers, J. (1991). Transitioning students with physical and multiple disabilities to supported employment. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1(4), 25-37.

328. Sowers, J., Verdi, M., Bourbeau, P., & Sheenham, M. (1985). Teaching job independence and flexibility to mentally retarded students through the use of a self-control package. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 18, 81-85.

329. Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1987). Facilitating merger through personnel preparation. Teacher Education and Special Education, 10(4), 185-190.

330. Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1988). Educating students with severe disabilities. Teaching Exceptional Children, 21(1), 16-19.

331. Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (Eds.) (1992). Curriculum considerations in inclusive classrooms: Facilitating learning for all students. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

332. Stainback, S., Stainback, W., Courtnage, L., Jaben, T. (1985). Facilitating mainstreaming by modifying the mainstream. Exceptional Children, 52(2), 144-152.

333. Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (1989). Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

334. Stainback, G.H., Stainback, S.B., & Stainback, W.C. (1988). Superintendents' attitudes toward integration. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 23(2), 92-96.

335. Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1987). Facilitating friendships. Education and Training in Mental Retardation , 22(1), 18-25.

336. Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (Eds.) (1990). Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

337. Stainback, W., Stainback, S., & Bunch, G. (1989). A rationale for the merger of regular and special education. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, & M. Forest, (Eds.) Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education (pp. 213-219). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

338. Stetson, F. (1984). Critical factors that facilitate integration: A theory of administrative responsibility. In N. Certo, N. Haring, & R. York (Eds.), Public school integration of severely handicapped students (pp. 65-81). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

339. Stone, B., & Brown, R. (1987). Preparing teachers for mainstreaming: Some critical variables for effective preservice programs. Educational Research Quarterly, 11(2), 7-10.

340. Strain, P.S. (1989). Ensuring quality of early intervention for children with severe disabilities. Unpublished manuscript. Pittsburg, PA: Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, University of Pittsburg School of Medicine.

341. Strully, J.L., & Strully, C.F. (1989). Family support to promote integration. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, & M. Forest (Eds.), Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education (pp. 213-219). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

342. Supported Employment Parent Training Technical Assistance (SEPT/TA) Project (1990). SEPT/TA Memo, 2(1), Minneapolis, MN: Pacer Center.

343. Taras, H. (1992, February). How to meet medical needs. The School Administrator, p. 50-51.

344. Taylor, S.J. (1988). Caught in the continuum: A critical analysis of the principles of the least restrictive environment. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 13(1), 41-53.

345. Taylor, S.J., Lakin, K.C., & Bradley, K.H. (1989). Permanency planning for children and youth: Out-of-home placement decisions. Exceptional Children, 55(6), 541-549.

346. Taylor, S., Racino, J., Knoll, J., & Lutfiyya, Z. (1985). The nonrestrictive environment: A resource manual on community integration for people with the most severe disabilities. Unpublished manuscript. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, Center on Human Policy.

347. Thousand, J.S., Fox, T.J., Reid, R., Godek, J., Williams, W., & Fox, W.L. (1986). The homecoming model: Educating students who present intensive educational challenges within regular education environments. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.

348. Thousand, J., Nevin-Parta, A., & Fox, W. (1987). Inservice training to support the education of learners with severe handicaps in their local schools. Teacher Education and Special Education, 10(1), 4-13.

349. Thousand, J.S., & Villa, R.A. (1988). Enhancing educational success through collaboration. Impact, 1(2), 14. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

350. Thousand, J.S., & Villa, R.A. (1990). Strategies for educating learners with severe disabilities within their local home schools and communities. Focus on Exceptional Children, 23(3), 1-24.

351. Thousand, J.S., & Villa, R.A. (1992) Sharing expertise and responsibilities through teaching teams. To appear in W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Support systems for education all students in the mainstream. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

352. Trohanis, P. (1988). Selected technical assistance and other resource projects related to services to young children with special needs and their families. Chapel Hill, NC: NECTAS.

353. Turley, C. R. (1989). Placement: The decision-making and documentation process. Unpublished Manuscript, Mid-South Regional Resource Center; University of Kentucky, Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute.

354. Turnbull, A.P., Brotherson, J.J., & Summers, J.A. (1985). The impact of deinstitutionalization on families: A family systems approach. In R.E. Bruininks & K.C. Lakin (Eds.), Living and learning in the least restrictive environment (pp.115-140). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

355. Turnbull, H.R., Turnbull, A.P.,Bronicki, G.J., Summers, J.A., & Roeder-Gordon, C. (1989). Disability and the family: A guide to decisions for adulthood. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

356. Turnbull, K., & Bronicki, G. (1989). Children can teach other children. Teaching Exceptional Children, 21(3), 64-65.

357. United Cerebral Palsy Associations (1992, Winter 91/Spring 92). Community supports. Family Support Bulletin, Washington, DC: United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., Community Services Division.

358. University of Kansas (1990). Families and Disability Newsletter, 2(2), (published 3 times quarterly). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Beach Center on Families and Disabilities.

359. University of Kansas (1990). Publications catalog. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Beach Center on Families and Disabilities.

360. University of Minnesota (1989). Publications from the Center for Residential and Community Services Institute on Community Integration. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, University Affiliated Program.

361. University of Utah (no date). A comprehensive program for effectively educating elementary students with severe handicaps in their neighborhood school (brochure). Logan, UT: University of Utah, Utah Elementary Integration Project.

362. VanBiervliet, A., & Sheldon-Wildgen, J. (1981). Liability issues in community-based programs: Legal principles, problem areas, and recommendations. Baltimore:Paul H. Brookes.

363. Vandercook, R., & York, J. (1989). A team approach to program development and support. In J. York, T. Vandercook, C. Macdonald, & S. Wolff (Eds.), Strategies for full inclusion, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

364. Vandercook, T., Wolff, S., & York, J. (Eds.) (1989). Learning together: Stories and strategies. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

365. Vandercook, T., York, J., Forest, M. (1989). The McGill Action Planning System (MAPS): A strategy for building the vision. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(3), 205-215.

366. Vandercook, T., York, J., & Johnson, S. (1991). Inclusive education for learners with severe disabilities: Print and Media Resources. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

366a. Vandercook, T., Wolf, S., Flower, D., & Doyle, M.B. (1992). Inclusive education for learners with severe disabilities: Print and Media Resources. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

367. Vandercook, T., York, J., Macdonald, C., & Gaylord, V. (1991, November). Impact, 4(3). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration, (Feature Issue on Inclusive Education).

368. Villa, R.A. (1989). Model public school inservice programs: Do they exist? Teacher Education and Special Education, 12, 173-176.

369. Villa, R.A., & Thousand, J.S. (1988). Enhancing success in heterogeneous classrooms and schools: The powers of partnership. Teacher Education and Special Education, 11(4), 144-154.

370. Villa, R.A., Thousand, J.S., Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1992). Restructuring for caring and effective education: An administrative guide to creating heterogeneous schools. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

371. Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C. (1985). Avoiding the "catch-22" in special education reform. Exceptional Children, 51(6), 497-502.

372. Wehman, P., Kregel, J., & Seyfarth, J. (1985). Transition from school to work for individuals with severe handicaps: A follow-up study. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 10(3), 132-136.

373. Wehman, P., Moon, M.S., Everson, J.M., Wood, W., & Barcus, J.M. (1988). Transition from school to work: New challenges for youth with severe disabilities. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

374. Wilcox, B., & Bellamy, T. (1987). The activities catalog: An alternative curriculum for youths and adults with severe disabilities. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

375. Wilcox, C., & Peake, L. (1988). Hey, what about me?: Activities for disabled children. Toronto, CANADA: Doubleday Canada Limited.

376. Wilcox, J., Sbardellati, E., & Nevin, A. (1987). Cooperative learning groups aid integration. Teaching Exceptional Children, 20(1), 61-63.

377. Will, M. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52(5), 411-415.

378. William, W., Fox, T.J., & Fox, W.L. (1989). Curriculum approaches: Assessment procedures and outcome selection: Manual IV of the Individual Program Design Series. Unpublished manuscript, Burlington, VT: University of Vermont.

379. Williams, W., Fox, T.J., Hall, S., & Fox, W.L. (1989). Outcomes and routines: Manual II of the Individual Program Design Series. Unpublished manuscript, Burlington, VT: University of Vermont.

380. William, W., Fox, T.J., Monley, M.K., McDermott, A., & Fox, W.L. (1989). Student record: Manual I of the Individual Program Design Series. Unpublished manuscript, Burlington, VT: University of Vermont.

381. Williams, W., Villa, R., Thousand, J., & Fox, W.L. (1989). Is regular class placement really the issue?: A response to Brown, Long, Udvari-Solner, Schwarz, VanDeventer, Ahlgren, Johnson, Gruenewald, & Jorgensen. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(4), 333-334.

382. Wilson, W. (1989). Administrative strategies for integrated educational programs. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Integration strategies for students with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

383. Wolak, M., York, J., & Corbin, N. (1992, February). Building new capacities to overcome tradition-bound practices. The School Administrator, p. 26-29.

384. Woodruff, G. (1980, Winter). Transdisciplinary approach for preschool children and parents. The Exceptional Parent, p. 13-16.

385. Woodruff, G., & McGonigel, M. J. (1988). Early intervention team approaches: The transdisciplinary model. In J. Jordan, J. Gallagher, P. Hutinger, & M. Karnes (Eds.), Early childhood special education: Birth to three (pp. 163-182). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children.

386. York, J., Giangreco, M.F., Vandercook, T., & MacDonald, C. (1992). Integrating support personnel in inclusive classrooms. In S. Stainback & W. Stainback (Eds.), Curriculum considerations in inclusive classrooms: Facilitating learning for all students (pp. 101-106). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

387. York, J., Long, E., Caldwell, N., Brown, L., Albright, K. Z., Rogan, P., Shiraga, B., & Marks, J. (1986). Teamwork strategies for school and community instruction. In H. S. Powell (Ed.) Pilot. Rockville, MD: American Occupational Therapy Association.

388. York, J., & Rainforth, B. (in press). Integrating therapy expertise in recreation/leisure activities for individuals for severe intellectual and physical disabilities. In L. Meyer, S. Schleien, & B. Biel (Eds.), Lifelong leisure skills and life styles for persons with developmental disabilities (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

389. York, J., Rainforth, B., & Dunn, W. (1990). Training needs of physical and occupational therapists who provided services to children and youth with severe disabilities. In A.P. Kaiser & C.M. McWhorter (Eds.), Preparing personnel to work with persons with severe disabilities (pp. 153-179). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

390. York, J., Rainforth, B., & Giangreco, M. F. (1990). Transdisciplinary teamwork and integrated therapy: Clarifying some misconceptions. Pediatric Physical Therapy, 2(2), 73-79.

391. York, J., Rainforth, B., & Wiemann, G. (1988). An integrated approach to therapy for school aged learners with developmental disabilities. Totline, 14(3), 36-40.

392. York, J., & Vandercook, T. (1988, Winter). What's in an IEP? Writing objectives for an integrated education. IMPACT, p. 16-19. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

393. York, J., & Vandercook, T. (1989). Designing an integrated education for learners with severe disabilities through the IEP process. In J. York, T. Vandercook, C. MacDonald, & S. Wolff (Eds.), Strategies for full inclusion. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

394. York, J., & Vandercook, T. (1990). Strategies for achieving an integrated education for middle school students with severe disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 11(5), 6-16.

395. York, J., & Vandercook, T. (1991, Winter). Designing an integrated program for learners with severe disabilities. Teaching Exceptional Children, p. 22-28.

396. York, J. & Vandercook, T. (1992, Winter). Designing an integrated program for learners with severe disabilities. Teaching Exceptional Children, p. 22-28.

397. York, J., Vandercook, T., MacDonald, C., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughey, E. (in press). Feedback from teachers and classmates about integrating middle school learners and severe disabilities in general classes. Exceptional Children.

398. York, J., Vandercook, T., MacDonald, C., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughey, E. (1989). Regular class integration of middle school students with severe disabilities: Feedback from teachers and classmates. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

399. York, J., Vandercook, T., MacDonald, C., & Wolff, S. (1989). Facilitating inclusion in regular classes. In J. York, T. Vandercook, C. MacDonald, & S. Wolff (Eds.), Strategies for full inclusion. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

400. York, J., Vandercook, T., MacDonald, C., & Wolff, S. (Eds). (1989). Strategies for full inclusion. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

401. York, J., Vandercook, T., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughey, E. (1988). Regular class integration at middle school: feedback from classmates and teachers. Impact, 1(2), 13. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

402. Young, R.K., Kemblowski, E.J., Blair, M.E., & Macfarlane, C.A. (1992). DECEL: An expert data-based system to aid in the identification and modification of problem behaviors in persons with disabilities. (user manual). Logan, UT: Utah State University, Department of Special Education.

403. Zeph, L.A. (1986). The C.H.O.I.C.E. Curriculum Model: A Curriculum Framework for Incorporating Choice-Making into Programs Serving Student with Severe Handicaps. Presentation given at the 2nd Annual TASH/New England Conference, Worchester, Mass. Orono, ME: University of Maine.

404. Zey, K. (1990). How to facilitate integration: A resource teacher's perspective. Entourage, 5(4), 13-15.

405. Zins, J., Curtis, M., Graden, J., & Ponti, C. (1988). Helping students succeed in the regular classroom: A guide for developing intervention assistance programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

406. Zivolich, S., & Bamberg, E. (1991). Free market strategies for improving employment services: Transitioning segregated day activity programs to integrated employment services. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1(4), 65-72.

Appendix A

Effective Practice Checklists

Education Agency: _____ Reviewers: _____

_____

_____

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - STATE LEVEL

	Effective Practice	• Status			Priority
		Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
1.	The state develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and considers the local school accountable for serving all students.[1]				
2.	The state develops policies that facilitate district implementation of inclusive programs and eliminates policies that serve as disincentives.				
3.	The state increases the awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive educational programs.[2]				
4.	The state promotes district implementation of inclusive programs.				
5.	The state evaluates inclusive programs and practice to assess the impact of state policies annually.				

• Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

1. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P. (1991). Synopsis (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P. Atwell, M., & Halvorsen, A. (1992). Systems change: A review of effective practices. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Education Agency: _____ Reviewers: _____

_____

_____

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - DISTRICT LEVEL

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
1. The district develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the local school is accountable for serving all students.[1,5]				
2. The district facilitates locally owned change at the school site by providing policies and procedures that support building level implementation.[5]				
3. The district promotes awareness, knowledge, and adoption of best practices for inclusive programs and the continual updating of these services by seeking inservice training and consultation on an ongoing basis.[2,5]				
4. All school buildings are accessible to students with disabilities served by the district and to other individuals with disabilities in the community who may be employed in or visit these sites.[3]				
5. Students with and without disabilities wait at school bus stops together and ride to and from school on the same bus.[3]				
6. Inclusive programs have been established at each school site and students with disabilities are members of age-appropriate (+/- 1yr.) general education classrooms in the same schools they would attend if they were non-disabled.[4]				
7. Coordinated transition programs for younger and older students have been established (i.e. preschool --> elementary --> MS/Jr. high --> HS --> post-secondary).[4]				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - DISTRICT LEVEL

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
8. School personnel evaluation criteria includes a standard on the inclusion of all students with disabilities into all aspects of the school community.[3]				
9. The district incorporates aspects of inclusive practices into its annual district-wide program evaluation activity.[5]				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

1. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P. (1991). Provoke (Bulletin), 2(2). San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Ferguson, S., Kaiser, N., Klassik, M., Ushlon, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

4. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Halvorsen, A., Sailsbury, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

5. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Karasoff, P., Atwell, M., & Halvorsen, A. (1992). Process change: A review of effective practices. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Education Agency: _____ Reviewers: _____

_____

_____

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL[1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT Part 1: School Mission/Philosophy				
1.1 The school develops and disseminates a mission statement which reflects the philosophy that all children can learn and the school is responsible for serving them.[2]				
1.2 The school philosophy emphasizes responsiveness to families and encourages active family involvement.[2]				
1.3 The school philosophy supports the need for ongoing inservice training, staff development, and technical assistance.[2]				
Part 2: Administrative Responsibilities & Staff Supervision				
2.1 The principal is ultimately responsible for program implementation including staff supervision and evaluation.				
2.2 Special and general education teachers are responsible for: - Attending faculty meetings. - Participating in supervisory duties (e.g., lunch/bus/yard duty). - Participating in extracurricular activities (e.g., chaperon dances, work with student clubs). - Following school protocol; keeping principal or appropriate administrator informed on an ongoing basis.				
2.3 There is a defined plan and/or process for supporting staff in implementation (i.e., time for team planning meetings, opportunities for staff development).				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date	Date	Date	✓
PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION Part 3: IEP Development				
3.1 Instructional staff and related service providers complete a functional assessment as an initial step in IEP development.				
3.2 Activity-based evaluations of student interests and family priorities are part of the functional assessment.				
3.3 Student programs are developed across the following curricular content areas: - Communication/Socialization - Personal Management (includes Self Determination) - Recreation/Leisure - Home/Domestic - General Education/Academic - Transition/Vocational				
3.4 Parents, general and special education teachers, related service personnel, and students collaborate to write joint IEP goals and objectives.				
3.5 IEPs include personal management objectives to promote student self-advocacy (i.e., decision-making, choice-making, individual responsibility).[2]				
3.6 IEP objectives are developed with families and reflect family priorities.				
3.7 Student IEPs include instruction of functional activities in age-appropriate school and community settings.				
3.8 IEP objectives reflect interaction with nondisabled peers.				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
3.9 IEPs for students age 14 and older include objectives that address skills and services needed to support transition to adult roles.				
3.10 IEP/placement teams use natural proportion guidelines when placing students with disabilities in general education classrooms.[1]				
3.11 The supports, aids, curricular modifications and other instructional methods required for the student to be successful in school and community settings are discussed during IEP meetings using a transdisciplinary approach.[3]				
3.12 The supports, aids, curricular modifications, and other instructional methods outlined in the IEP are implemented and updated according to the student's progress.[3]				
Part 4: Collaborative Teamwork				
4.1 Teams meet weekly to plan instructional support services for all students.				
4.2 The team collaborates to: 1) develop peer network/interactive systems; 2) adapt learning objectives for students within the context of the core curriculum; 3) make material and environmental adaptations; and 4) provide physical assistance as needed.[1]				
4.3 Teams collaborate to provide related services in inclusive settings.				
4.4 Teams initiate systematic transition planning to support successful transition from one program to another.[1]				
4.5 Team members meet informally with one another to discuss ongoing inclusion issues and maintain continuous communication.				
4.6 Teams assist families in accessing community resources.[1]				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
Part 5: Professional Practices				
5.1 All instructional staff work with students in age-appropriate general education and community settings.				
5.2 Related services staff provide services in general education classrooms and in community settings using transdisciplinary and consultative approaches.				
5.3 Instructional staff and related service providers develop adaptations for individual students to facilitate independence which are useful across environments.				
5.4 Instructional staff plan activities using materials, instructional procedures and environments that are age-appropriate and individualized.				
5.5 Instructional staff adapt the general education curriculum to address academic and/or community-referenced content areas to meet IEP objectives.				
5.6 Instructional staff incorporate ability awareness into general education curriculum on diversity and the human experience.				
5.7 Instructional staff and related service providers ensure interaction with nondisabled peers in all activities.[1]				
5.8 Instructional staff implement positive behavior management strategies that utilize natural cues/corrections with support from related services personnel and other team members.				
5.9 Instructional staff demonstrate positive attitudes towards and age-appropriate interactions with all students.[1]				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
STUDENT INCLUSION Part 6: Student Activities				
6.1 Students have access to all school environments for instruction and interactions.[1]				
6.2 Students participate in and are included in activities such as:[1] - music - general education classes - art - home economics - library - work experience - gym - recess/break - lunch - computer use - assemblies - graduation exercises - clubs - field trips				
6.3 Students with disabilities are involved in extracurricular school activities such as:[1] - clubs - scouts - dances - after school recreation/day care programs				
Part 7: Interaction with Peers				
7.1 Students' instructional programs incorporate interaction with nondisabled students in the following areas:[1] - Communication/Socialization -Home/Domestic - Personal Management (includes Self Determination) - Recreation/Leisure - Transition/Vocational - General Education/Academic				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

EFFECTIVE PRACTICE CHECKLIST - BUILDING LEVEL [1]

Effective Practice	* Status			Priority
	Date:	Date:	Date:	✓
7.2 Students are involved with age-appropriate, nondisabled peers in structured interaction programs such as:[1] - Peer tutoring in school and community environments - "PALS" (Partners at Lunch) or lunch buddies - Circle of Friends - Co-worker support at job training site - MAPS - General education class activities				
7.3 Social interaction programs are:[1] - Well organized - Positive in orientation (emphasizing students' strengths, focusing on functional activities) - Well-attended - Supported by principal, faculty, and parents - Viewed as a positive experience by students				

* Status Key: 1 = Practice is effectively implemented; 2 = Practice is implemented but needs improvement; 3 = Practice is not implemented

1. The majority of the effective practice items contained in this checklist have been adapted from: Halvorsen, A., Smithey, L., & Neary, T. (1992). Implementation site criteria for inclusive programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, PEERS Project.

2. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from: Meyer, L.H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(4), 251-263.

3. These effective practice items have been taken or adapted from : Freagon, S., Kaiser, N., Kincaid, M., Usilton, R., & Smith, A. (1992). Individual school district profile for planning and implementing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education and their transition to adult living and continuing education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Project CHOICES/Early CHOICES, S.A.S.E.D.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

Technical Assistance Planning Forms

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLANNING FORM

Education Agency: _____ **Date:** _____

Practice(s): _____ **Planning Group Members:** _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Strategies	Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Status	Comments

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLANNING FORM

Education Agency: _____ **Date:** _____

Practice(s): _____ **Planning Group Members:** _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Strategies	Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Status	Comments

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLANNING FORM

Education Agency: _____ **Date:** _____

Practice(s): _____ **Planning Group Members:** _____

_____

_____

_____

Strategies	Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Status	Comments

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLANNING FORM

Education Agency: _____ **Date:** _____

Practice(s): _____ **Planning Group Members:** _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Strategies	Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Status	Comments

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLANNING FORM

Education Agency: _____ **Date:** _____

Practice(s): _____ **Planning Group Members:** _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Strategies	Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Status	Comments